

THE
REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 1.—JANUARY—1909.

I.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE HEBREWS TO
CIVILIZATION.

BY THE REV. CALVIN K. STAUDT, PH.D.

The religion which we have inherited from God's chosen people is multiform in its value and significance. It is capable of being approached from different points of view; and in whatever way one approaches it, it always appears to the unbiased heart and mind as a precious gem set in the midst of less attractive jewels. Inherently, it is the same message, being the same yesterday, to-day and forever. But as the *Zeitgeist* varies with the centuries, so shifts the ground from which we view our inherited religion. And, indeed, this shifting of the emphasis has resulted in an ever-increasing valuation of Israel's contribution. Once it was considered primarily as God's way telling us how to get safely to heaven, this contribution of the Hebrews; then, as an elaborate, all-embracing law telling us what to do and what not to do. Once it appeared emphatically as a message of comfort and consolation; then again as a power which suddenly grips the heart and abruptly changes it. Once it was looked upon chiefly as a revelation of divine love effecting the forgiveness of sins; and in these latter days it looms up as an indispensable ele-

ment of culture and civilization—as an element which has helped to make us what we are and what we have; as, in the words of Benjamin Kidd, “the sole secret of our civilization and progress.” This, then, shall be our worthy task, namely, to elucidate how the Hebraic is one of the most potent factors in this teleological process of the ushering in of the perfect man in the perfect society.

As a prerequisite to this study, it is in order to ask what exactly we are to understand by the Hebrew element and how, if at all, it is to be distinguished from the Christian. In spite of elaborate discussions there are still variations of opinion. However, it must always be recognized that Judaism and Christianity are the same movement. Christianity is the flower of which Judaism is the bud. Jesus and the Apostles are genetically related to that which preceded. The Hebrew element is Christian and the Christian is Hebrew. The Old Testament is simply pre-natal to Christianity, being “to the New Testament what the unborn child is to the born.” The appearance of Jesus was not Minerva-like, having no vital and organic relation with historical processes; His appearance was simply one step—the last—in the unfolding of a people with a passion for the true God and a genius for moral excellence. There is a tendency on the part of the latest school of German theologians to “account” for Jesus by endeavoring to show that He and His first interpreters stand merely for a vast receptacle in which the higher life of the world then existing—Greek, Roman, Jewish, Egyptian, Alexandrian—reservoired itself. Whether future scholarship will substantiate this thesis is a question. But the relation between Jesus and the house of Israel is not an hypothesis. There is no chasm between the Old Testament prophet, priest, and sage and the New Testament Christ, apostle, and martyr. For Christianity, the prophetic element worked out truth, righteousness, and peace; the priestly the filthiness of sin, the forgiveness of sin, and vicarious suffering; the wisdom the universality of God and the ethical life pertaining to all men. By the Hebrew in civiliza-

tion we are then to understand that which was revealed, taught, contributed by the Hebrews as a *race* and *nation* to, what Matthew Arnold defines, "the humanization of man in society, and the satisfaction for him, in society, of the true law of human nature."

Hence our purpose shall be to deal with the Hebrews as a nation—Ancient Israel. The ardent Jew of to-day projects into the future a mission of his people; but the mission of the sons of Jacob ended with the missionary activities of Paul. Let us then consider in order, first, the contributory feature of nations, and Israel's place among them; secondly, the nature of Israel's contribution, and the mode of creating it; thirdly, the intrinsic force of Hebraism, and the unequivocal testimony of history.

First, then, the contributory feature of nations, and Israel's place among them. In the economy of human progress every race has its office to fulfill. There is a Pilot of History in whom nations as well as individuals live and move and have their being. The guiding hand of Providence rests over the affairs of a people; and the rise and fall of nations, as well as the onward march of civilization, is due not to mere chance; for all history is a teleological process, tending toward

"That God, which ever lives and loves,
One God, one law, one element,
And one far-off divine event,
To which the whole creation moves."

Penetrating beneath the transient and the temporal to the permanent and eternal, one finds that there are in the onward flow of history order, continuity, progression; in which each generation builds upon the accumulated results of the former generation. The Ancient World has contributed the forces which have entered into the making of European and Modern History; and the nations now existing are grinding out truth for the benefit of generations still unborn. We are the heirs of all the ages. Everything good and true and beautiful, which men have ever thought and felt, is ours to-day to enjoy, to

possess, to utilize. Others have planted and sowed and struggled and suffered and labored and experimented, and we have entered into the fruits of their labors, having bestowed no labor upon our harvest. Humanity is, and always has been, indebted to certain individuals that preceded it; but the richest heritage comes, not from outstanding persons, but rather from outstanding nations. Within nations have their great men; but great men merely embody in the highest degree the characteristic longings and gropings of the nation. They are outstanding peaks, not of a plain, but of a mountain range.

A knowledge of history is more valuable than a knowledge of biography, in spite of Carlyle's assertion that the history of the world is but the biography of great men. Nations make a vaster contribution to the world's life and thought than individuals. History has a normative value, a lesson, and a moral significance. Alexander Pope says, "The proper study of mankind is man"; but he would have conveyed a greater and more eternal truth should he have said, "The proper study of man is mankind." There is a lesson and a message for us to-day in every idea of the past which became universally and nationally socialized. Socialized ideas and passions and emotions can teach us more of man, of moral evil and of good, than all isolated individual philosophers can. The highest problems of life are worked out, not by the isolated man, but by mankind. Nations have a mission greater than individuals. Just as we teach the divine mission of persons, so we must teach the divine mission of nations.

However, of the many nations which have existed, there are only a few which have been real factors in the world's progress. There are actually nations which have subsisted on such a dead level of monotonous existence that their very names have long ago been forgotten. Of others we know only the name and nothing more, as there is no tangible evidence of their existence. These maintained, for a longer or a shorter period, a mere subsistence; they have added nothing materially or spiritually to the world's wealth. But in the case of others the

very opposite is true. Imbued with a spirit eager to secure that which was higher, driven by an impulse growing out of a desire toward humankind, impelled by a force from without, they gradually lifted themselves up to higher planes of life and thought. It is the history of these nations—and only these—which make up the history of the world. They have led the world in each step of its progress; each has added a quota to the making of modern civilization.

As an illustration of existing nations having a mission and making a contribution there are France, Germany, England, and the United States. France is setting the world agog in fashions and manners; and her life and genius is writ upon, and subsists in, the changing styles of the civilized world. Germany is making her contribution in scientific scholarship; and the whole world is drinking at her pure fountain of knowledge, perennially refreshing itself. England has been the laboratory and experiment station for the working out of democracy and principles of representative government. And upon the shoulders of the United States has fallen the task of working out the problem of applied morality; wherein the great ethical principles long since theoretically held are to become applicable and workable, and whereby humankind is to be infused with a sense of service and helpfulness. As an illustration of the nations of the Ancient World in which the roots of modern civilization are planted deeply, there is Egypt with her passion and preparation for the after-life; Assyria and Babylonia with their desire and creation of material splendor; Phenicia with her craving for commerce and adventure; Israel with her all-controlling motive for the true God and true religion; Greece with her all-absorbing passion for art, literature and philosophy; and Rome with her inclination toward law and order.

But among these the Arbiter of Nations assigned the highest mission to Greece and Israel. Along the mountain range of nations, in which each nation stands out as a distinct peak, the peak of Hellenism and that of Hebraism project most promi-

nently and reach nearest to the sky. These two have been the primary elements in the making of European and modern history. They are the fundamentals upon which the pillars of life and civilization are grounded. They suggest the two streams of influence which have percolated down through history and have made this world a veritable paradise. Or, to change the figure, they have been the warp and woof of two unbroken threads out of which our entire civilization is constructed. Hellenism, derived from Hellas or Greece, stands for the method of culture and makes life broad; Hebraism, derived from Hebrew or Israel, stands for the method of religion, and makes life deep. On the one hand, the world owes its whole conception of the intellectual life—art, literature, philosophy—to a little country known in ancient days as Hellas; and, on the other hand, the world owes its whole conception of the true God and true religion, likewise, to a little country known in the days of the patriarchs as the Promised Land. Similarly, in trying to decide which one of these is superior to the other, we cannot but feel, as we shall readily see, that, after all, out of Israel there has issued forth the greater blessing.

Having seen Israel's place among contributing nations, let us now, in the second place, turn to a consideration of her contribution and to an analysis of the method in which that contribution was created and wrought out. And there is no better way of approaching this truth than by thinking of her as a laboratory—a laboratory in which experiments were performed, results tabulated, and a contribution made to the existing sum of life and thought. A real laboratory exists for the purpose of creating, of adding something to the existing sum of material or spiritual wealth. In a chemical laboratory the result of the interaction of acids, salts, and metals placed in a crucible is a new substance. In a physical laboratory energy and force, heat and light are brought together in such a relation that a new resultant is produced. And, indeed, there is also such a thing as a spiritual laboratory—real and substan-

tial as a physical laboratory—for the purpose of working out truth and spiritual realities.

Now, in the world's greatest spiritual laboratory—Israel, there were the component factors of the land, the people, and the Director, who is God; and in the interaction of these the problem of how to live, which is the greatest problem of life, was solved.

The land was the apparatus of the laboratory. Modern historians and sociologists recognize the influence of soil and climate and the physical features of a country upon the make-up of a people. Palestine typically illustrates this principle. This country comprised in ancient days as now the northern border of the parallelogram of Arabia. In a measure Israel was hemmed in on every side. On the north was a mountain ridge across which her inhabitants never passed; on the east and south a barren desert, which they had learned to dread; on the west an unbroken sea-coast, without a single natural harbor—"nothing to tempt men in nor to tempt men out." How necessary this seclusion was for the working out of moral and religious truth. And yet, while she was secluded she was also in a measure open, being, at least, accessible now and then to the civilizing influences of the nations round about. She was lying between two continents—Asia and Africa; between two primæval homes of men—the valley of the Euphrates and that of the Nile; between two great centers of empire—Western Asia and Egypt. And so she became the bridge and the passageway of the world. No one has expressed the significance of this better than George Adam Smith (to whom we have already been largely indebted for the sentences just indited) when he says, "In this strange mingling of bridge and harbor, of high-road and field, of battleground and sanctuary, of seclusion and opportunity—rendered possible through the striking division of surface into mountain and plain—lies all the secret of Syria's history, under the religion which has lifted her fame to glory."

In this little country there was also every variety of climate

—from the snow-capped Hermon with an alpine climate to the depressions of the Dead Sea with a sub-tropical climate. There was a rainy season lasting from October to May, followed by a season of dryness from May to October. It was a country which the nomads of the desert described as a land flowing with milk and honey, seeing that it was better than the barren desert from which they came; but, as a matter of fact, Palestine was merely an oasis in the great desert of Arabia, and with the exception of the Maritime Plain and the Valley of Esdrælon, which were very seldom occupied by the children of Israel, the products of the land were scant and uncertain. In fact, it was a land given to drought, which often came two years in succession, to famine, to pestilence, to locusts, coming every fifth or sixth year, and to earthquakes, too.

Such was the apparatus of the laboratory which the Pilot of History prepared through His infinite wisdom at the creation of the world, to the end that it might be possible to create the highest religion therein. And we cannot conceive of another country which would have lent itself better to the service of moral and religious ideas than that of Palestine. How different from that of Ancient Greece, where another great problem—the problem of culture—was worked out! This country was entirely different from that of Canaan; and as a matter of fact an idea was worked out which was diametrically opposite to that contributed by the Hebrews. Hellas was surrounded by the sea and had a coast consisting of jutting promontories, secluded harbors, smiling bays and sprinkled isles. Open on every side, she felt the leveling power of commerce and was susceptible to the varied influences of the world. Her rivers were rushing torrents, full of sparkling waterfalls. The land itself was cut up into every variety of independent valleys, mountain glens and romantic dells. And over land and sea was a brilliant sky, the play of light and shade of which was poetically tender and winsomely beautiful. Such is a parallel example of another laboratory, fitted out by Providence for the production of beauty and thought, another civilizing force.

The second component factor entering into the production of true religion was the people. No matter how well equipped the laboratory, the experiments will never be of a high order, neither original nor contributory, unless the experimenter has an aptitude and a genius for his work. The land and the people must go hand in hand; and in accordance with this principle, a people were called—for this already selected country—psychologically and temperamentally fitted for the working out of the religious problem. To this land of promise, this oasis of the desert, many nomadic tribes had come to settle; but, not being the chosen people, they were unable to make proper use of the tools at hand; and instead of developing a monotheistic religion, they fell into the rankest polytheism and the most obscene religious practices. Finally, however, the Arbiter of Nations took out of that great Semitic family a handful of people known as the Hebrews, whose schooling in the desert, where nature is monotonous, silent and illiberal, was long; and led them into this chosen land.

As they were the last to enter Canaan they not only had a long schooling in the desert, but prior to their entrance had been brought in touch with the Babylonian and the Egyptian civilizations. They possessed such characteristics as a yearning for dreamy ease, a strange and ever-present shiftlessness, a spirit of unity which preserves everything in its purest simplicity and an idealism which made religion possible. Their religious genius was already evidenced prior to their entrance into Canaan by their choosing of Yahweh—a God ethically superior to that of any other tribal God. Upon the barren hills of the central plain of Palestine they eked out a bare existence. When annoyed and harrassed by the neighboring tribes they put their trust in the Lord of Hosts, and He came and fought their battles with and for them. When the Bedouin tribes of the desert came up at the time of the harvest and snatched away the meager products of the land, they turned their faces in heartfelt sorrow to the Lord of Harvest, and He gave them comfort and consolation. When a season of drought

came—and these were frequent—they could not, as down in Egypt, refresh a garden by letting in the water of the Nile, but they had to look up to the God of Heaven, who maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth His rain on the just and the unjust. Again, these people by having been brought in contact with the nations around them absorbed and digested the civilization of each, gave to it a religious significance, and interpreted it from the God-point of view.

Such were the workers, the experimenters, who were chosen to work in God's great spiritual laboratory, to the end that the true God and true religion might be found, and the problem of how to live be solved. Greece, again, is a parallel example of how a peculiar people were chosen for a definite task. To this beautiful Hellas there came also, at first, a people who were not the chosen people. Although they were stimulated to works of art through the charm and intoxication of land and sea, nevertheless they lacked something quite essential to the production of finality in culture. And so the Arbiter of Nations took out of that great Indo-European family a handful of people whose schooling in the forest and the wilderness had developed strength, vigor, accuracy, discrimination, fixity of purpose, and power of dealing with combinations and complexities; and led them into this chosen land. The beauty of mountain and glen, of river and sea made their hearts poetically tender, and the mystery behind nature beckoned their minds into philosophic pursuits. How parallel, indeed, is the divine working among nations, and how an insight in the hand of Providence in one nation helps us to see that same hand in other nations!

The third component factor in this historical process enabling Israel to make a contribution was the direction of the Director Himself; or the Power above the Hebrew nation which was always active and immanent, working toward a definite end and using great men as the instrument of its evolution. At first the Director requested the experimenters to separate themselves sharply from the rest of the world. In this they were

assisted by such men as Moses, Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha. Then they were asked to acquaint themselves very intimately with the Director, in order that they might understand more fully who He is and what methods He would employ. At this time the literary prophets were of the greatest assistance. Then the Director had them transported into another country, through which they learned that the Director of their laboratory was the Director of the whole world. Then, through varied experiences, and by coming in touch with outside influences, they were taught and made to see the awfulness of sin and the universality of truth. And so the Director came nearer and nearer, and their vision became clearer and clearer, until finally the Director of the laboratory came Himself in person. It was Jesus. Many did not recognize Him; a few, however, saw that it was He. His instruction was clear and simple and definite; the ideal life was lived; the problem of how to live was solved; the work for which the laboratory was founded was finished; the thing created was given broadcast to the world; and the national life was destroyed. A record was kept of what was done, and this record is the Old and New Testament. The Bible, therefore, contains, and is, the laboratory record of a people divinely chosen, who experimented in religion under divine guidance until they found the highest. When the misplaced records are chronologically arranged, this book gives us every step of the process of the working out of the problem of how to live through the finding of the true God and true religion.

This, then, is what we are to understand by the contribution of the Hebrews, which has since become a potent factor toward the making of the perfect man in the perfect society. The process, though not the result, is akin to what this same Director did in Hellas, where He guided, directed, and instructed a people, until in God's laboratory of culture the highest reaches were attained; after which the thing created was scattered, the country overrun, and the record preserved in art, literature, and philosophy.

And now, in the third place, let us examine the intrinsic value of this finished product of the Hebrews as a civilizing force as well as the clear witness of history. That it is a civilizing force, in spite of some critics, there can be no question. The dogmatism of Christianity and of the creeds is fearfully arraigned to-day, and the thinking world is not much disturbed; but when there are those—as there are a few—who try to disturb the source and undervalue the pristine and fundamental truth as it sprang from the Hebrew race and nation, either by giving no recognition to Israel's contribution, or by denouncing it as a retarding factor of civilization, then we rise up to show the fallacy of the situation. There are certain mystics, either theologic or poetic, who, disregarding historical processes, find their God, their religion, their ideas, their all in immediate and direct revelation and none particularly in biblical revelation. There are matter-of-fact scientists, such as Haeckel, who, trying to solve the "riddle of the universe" by reason only, disregard revelation as well as an all-pervading design in history. There are certain artistic philosophers, such as Nietzsche, who arraign the teachings of Jesus and "denounce the Christian principle of brotherhood and equality as immoral and dangerous to life itself." There are certain historians, such as Gibbons, who, exalting the Hellenic, deprecate the Hebraic and represent the Christian religion rather as a retarding than a helpful force in the life of the European people.

But what a depreciation of the highest force of civilization and human progress! What a one-sided interpretation of life and history! We cannot but feel the mental, moral, and social uplift of that which was reservoired in Israel for the healing of the nations. Measured by the principle of pragmatism which asks, "How does it work?" who will deny that in this contribution of the Hebrews there are just the very doctrines and ideas which make for the humanization of man in society? First of all, this contribution is a religious contribution, and nothing so pervades all man's activities as the religious. And lo! it is the true religion. In faith in the true God and true

religion there is and always has been the idea to be and the dynamic to become like the object of faith. In a fatherhood of God men are inspired to a brotherhood of man, which ushers in social amelioration and universal progress. In a higher law of righteousness and a regenerated heart accrues a new social order. In short, through the inversion of the primitive values of selfishness into the humanitarian values of altruism there is added the most potent factor to higher evolution.

The testimony of history on this matter is also clear and unmistakable. Such nations which were not touched by the stream of Hebraism have remained barren and unattractive; while those through which this stream flowed have blossomed into civilization and become productive in material and spiritual things. One is often unable to determine the influence of the Hebraic apart from the Hellenic, inasmuch as these two elements went often side by side and even mingled. Modern civilization is a very composite product; it has resulted from the mutual action and reaction upon one another of, at least, these two inherited historical agencies and minor ones besides, especially the Teutonic spirit. Should, however, the Hebrew element not have entered into history, the modern world would be something wholly different from what it is. Upon the ruins of the Roman Empire, which was the great absorbent of the Christian religion as well as Greek culture, arose the Middle Ages. During this period the Hebraic had merely an attenuated influence, in spite of the fact that every thing was summed up in the Roman Church. It was an attenuated influence; first, because the Bible was imperfectly known through imperfect Latin translations, and secondly, because it was considered a "sacred holy horror"—a book to be worshipped rather than studied. Beginning with the Reformation the Hebraic became a fertilizing influence. The Bible and no longer the Church was to be the seat of authority. The rediscovery of the Bible in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries stirred men's minds and awakened them as from a sleep. Greek manuscripts of the New Testament were collected; Erasmus

published his "Novum Instrumentum," and the Scriptures were read in the original tongues and translations made therefrom. The living source was opened, and the result was a revival of religion and a recasting of theology.

Indeed, the Bible has since the Reformation become a most potent factor in history. It has gone to the making, not merely of all ecclesiastical history, but also of a great deal of secular history. That it is closely interwoven with the history of England, Scotland, and America we need not be told. In his address before the Pennsylvania Bible Society, Ambassador Bryce recently said: "This [Bible] is still a tie between your people and ours, still one of those ancient foundations of common thought and knowledge which enables both to retain a unity of intellectual life and to understand one another." It has often been pointed out that the English and the German translations of the Scriptures did more than anything else to form the English and the German languages respectively and give them their present shape. European and English literature has its birth in the commingling of the Hellenic and the Hebraic; and, indeed, the latter is no secondary factor when we take into consideration, as Washington Gladden has pointed out, that there are one hundred times more allusions and references to the Bible in literature than to any other book. Modern art is likewise the product of these two ancestral forces, in which the Hebraic furnished many of the subjects and themes and the ground for the emotions of faith and hope, ecstasy and suffering. And, finally, who can measure all the beneficent influences of the Hebrews as a means of culture and enjoyment, of progress and achievement?

There is, seemingly, also something prophetic in this historical survey. If it is true that in the economy of human progress Israel fulfilled the highest office and all history testifies to the beneficent influences issuing therefrom, then it behooves us to continue to cherish this gift; and that, not imperfectly as we may know it in a second-hand manner, but as it is embodied in the original source. Yea, because of changed

conditions in modern society, and because of our psychological knowledge of the unfolding of human life, and because of our present educational ideals, there is the greatest need for accentuating the importance of a more thorough and universal study of the laboratory records of the Hebrews. If the Hebrew element functioned on life heretofore, it should continue to function; and that with greater effectiveness. Religious education is the slogan of to-day, and in this the Bible must have, in the very nature of things, the foremost place. There is the greatest need in this day and generation for an intelligent propagation of Israel's contribution; for a more faithful and systematic study of the Bible. Few things will do more for the humanization of man in society in the future, for the welfare of the coming generation, than a more vital and thorough study of the pristine laboratory notes of the Hebrews—in the home, in the church, in the school.

MYERTOWN, PA.

II.

SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF RELIGIOUS REVIVALS.

BY THE REV. H. M. J. KLEIN, PH.D.

Looking back through history, we find that all nations have been subject at times to great swells of religious feeling. These impetuous outbursts of interest for matters of personal religion have been characterized, in a very broad and loose sense of the term, by the word "revival." In accordance with this comprehensive usage of the word we may say that revival tendencies and phenomena are to be found among all races of men accepting any possible form of religion from North-American Indians to Arabian Mohammedans. In this vague sense, too, the Old Testament efforts for the betterment of Israel, the Pentecostal Era of the New Testament, the Crusades of the Middle Ages, the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century, the Puritan Reaction of the seventeenth century, and all great epochal movements which have characterized the development of religion may be designated as revivals.

Strictly speaking, however, revivals are a modern product in so far as they refer to a particular religious method and a particular type of religious experience. In our discussion we shall use the term in its more restricted sense and shall have in mind more specifically the great religious awakenings in England, Ireland, and America during the past two centuries. We shall be compelled to do this because in a scientific discussion we are expected to interpret not generalities but specific phenomena, and the phenomena of the revivals of the past two centuries in England, Ireland, and America are historically recorded and unmistakable.

Our task, then, is two-fold. First, to state briefly the his-

toric facts and factors entering into those social movements known as modern religious revivals. Second, to seek to interpret those facts so far as we are able in the light of natural laws and processes; to show that these social movements, like everything else in nature and life, depend largely upon a combination of factors that can be analyzed and described and conform to laws that are approximately as absolute as are the laws of physical phenomena.

What, then, are the natural elements that have entered into the great revivals of modern history? What were the physical, racial, mental, social, and religious predispositions of the people among whom these revivals took place? What was the nature of the personality of the leaders? What was the method of their work? What was the message they delivered? To what motives did they appeal? Who were the first to respond? What were the physical and psychical phenomena that characterized their converts? What were the temporary and the permanent results of the revivals so far as their value to society was concerned?

A study of modern revival methods must begin with the great awakening in New England under Jonathan Edwards in 1734. The inhabitants of New England in the early part of the eighteenth century can be characterized as dogmatic and yet emotional. The stern solemnity of the Puritan and the deep melancholy sensibilities of the Saxon and the Dane flowed in their veins. They were children of superstition as the uncanny history of witchcraft only too plainly attests. They were fearless of man but fearful of God and the Devil. The wrath of God and the thought of hell made them tremble. Spiritually they were in a state of decline brought on by reaction against the rigid Puritan standards of their fathers. To this people there came as spiritual leader a man of strange personal fascination, a man in whose blood there flowed the practical sense of the Saxon, and a Celtic strain of lofty and sustained imagination, all the richness of sensibility and mysticism

that is found in the Welsh race. His message consisted in an appeal to the fears of his hearers. By his intense earnestness he stirred them to the depths of their souls by picturing "the kind of hell an infinite God would arrange who was infinitely enraged against a human being who had infinitely sinned in rejecting God's infinite love." Anyone who has ever read Edwards's sermons can testify to the imprecatory character of his message. The very titles are significant, "Sinners in the hands of an angry God," "The wrath of God upon the wicked to the uttermost," "The eternity of Hell torments," etc. He contended that deliverance from evil and its consequences was something tragic and that men needed a spiritual convulsion before spiritual growth could follow. His first convert in this revival was a single young woman. From her the contagion spread throughout New England and under Whitefield its territory was bounded by Maine and Georgia. As to the phenomena accompanying this outburst of religious feeling, one is not surprised to learn that there were many manifestations of mental and nervous disorders. While Edwards himself did not regard these bodily affections as the high proof of God's favor (here his Saxon good sense is evident), there followed in his footsteps a number of men less judicious than he, who brought with them a flood of fanaticism and delusion. They taught that the most certain sign of God's grace was found, not in life and conduct, but in enthusiastic emotion. They took their own conversion experiences and made them the normal standard by which to judge all others. Soon physical manifestations, tremblings and faintings, shrieking and weeping, agony and distress, dreams and visions were looked upon as the certain evidence of God's indwelling. An eye-witness records the symptoms as follows: "Many fell on the ground, they lay for a time speechless and motionless, then followed convulsions and terrible shrieking. Numbers in a congregation would be in that condition at the same time. When they did not swoon away they were upbraided for hardness of heart. The effect was often increased by the indirect suggestion of

the speaker as to the result wrought elsewhere. Women by the score became hysterical. When the preacher grew calm they grew calm, when he thundered their violent struggles immediately returned." As to results, we find on the one hand an increase of congregations in New England and a temporary heightening of moral tone in social life; on the other hand we find a speedy reaction, much back sliding, for four years not a single soul added to Edwards's church in Northampton. That the revival had not exercised an enduring influence on the community in general is evident since only a few years after these ecstacies of devotion there was an outbreak of antagonism and Edwards himself was exiled. Pathological history shows a disheartening list of mental and nervous disorders in the New England of this period, and moral history shows that the life of New England at the latter part of the eighteenth century was lower than ever before.

John Wesley, on one of his numerous walks from Oxford to London to visit William Law, author of "The Serious Call," read an account of the New England revival and the English awakening followed. Conditions in England were unique in the middle of the eighteenth century. It was near the close of Walpole's ministry. The nation was prosperous in trade, but most ungodly in life. Laws were severe, discipline was weak, education was neglected, crime flourished and there were great outbreaks of mobs. The Church had sunk into insignificance, the clergy were worldly and indolent. "In the higher circles of society every one laughs," said Montesquieu, "if one talks of religion." The lower classes were ignorant and brutal, neglected and hardened, living for the passion of the hour. Yet at the fall of Walpole new forces and cravings and aims which lay under the crust began to make themselves felt. John Wesley was the man of God sent to awaken the slumbering instincts of a new age. Like Edwards, Wesley combined deep emotion with superb practical sense. He was calm, self-possessed, terribly in earnest. He had a dominating personality, his presence was said to have been hypnotic and to have

created an atmosphere of awe. His searching eye was one of the strongest elements in the man. He had the sound judgment of the Saxon race, and yet a deep strain of superstition. "He lived in a world of wonders and divine interpretations. It was a miracle if the rain stopped and allowed him to set forward on a journey. It was a judgment of Heaven if a hailstorm burst over a town which had been deaf to his preaching. One day, he tells us, when he was tired and his horse fell lame, he thought cannot God heal man or beast by any means or without any, and immediately his headache ceased and his horse's lameness in the same moment. With a still more childish fanaticism he guided his conduct by drawing lots or watching the particular texts at which his Bible opened" (Green). His message differed from that of Edwards's in that he appealed somewhat more to the divine in the human soul, and yet at bottom it was an appeal to the element of fear and to the horrors of hell. The Wesleyan revival was practically kindled at Bristol and Kingswood where dwelt, according to Wesley's own statement, the most primitive, brutal, and ignorant of England's population. Wesley says in his "Journal," Vol. 1, page 170, "that they were but one remove from the beasts that perish, utterly without desire of instruction as well as without the means of it." The suggestibility of these people was so great that under the excitement of Wesley's preaching they would fall down on every side torn with a kind of convulsive motion. Reflex phenomena first appeared in modern times under Wesley. They spread rapidly. Men would be struck down as though by lightning and writhe in agony of soul. Wesley regarded these extravagances as the throes of the new birth. The mental and nervous strain of the revival excitement soon became so great that many were on the verge of insanity. The wildest excesses followed. Others who lacked much of the good sense of Wesley introduced a reign of terror. I quote from Wesley's "Journal," Vol. 2, page 32: "There were agonies and contortions of bodies of many little children, loud breathing of men and women half-strangled and gasping

for life, outcries, bitter anguish, faces turning red and then almost black, convulsions, awful contagion sweeping over the stifled crowd, numbers carried into the parsonage, where they struggled or lay as dead. The breaking of pews and benches, the trance, the demoniac shriek, the uncontrollable laughter, a child of seven years old seeing visions, a woman rolling on the ground and tearing grass with her hands, some dropping in a heap on the road home." All these manifestations you find recorded in Wesley's "Journal." Toward the end of his life Wesley's faith in these outward manifestations was shaken, the fervor of his superstition died down into the calm of age and his common sense discouraged in his followers the fanatical outbursts which marked the opening of the revival.

Within a decade of Wesley's death the great Kentucky revival took place in America. The Scotch-Irish pioneers of Kentucky had in them a deep strain of the emotionalism of the Celt. In this new wild country they lived without restraints of law, custom or religion. Their habit of life in the wilderness developed in them quick response to stimulus and strong motor tendencies. Bacon in his "History of American Christianity" puts the historic conditions thus: "When there was brought to bear upon these Kentucky pioneers the protracted camp meeting and they were suddenly aroused by the most fervid imaginative and reiterative appeal, there resulted as perfect a combination of conditions for the production of mental and nervous infection as the world has ever seen." The revival began in a district in Logan County known as Rogue's Harbor, because the citizenship of the place was made up largely of murderers, horse thieves, and fugitives. James McGready and Peter Cartwright were the leaders of the movement. McGready is said to have arrayed hell before the wicked that they trembled and quaked. McMaster in his "History of the United States" gives a vivid account of the details of this extraordinary religious movement. Two women first became greatly excited and by contagion their fervor spread through the whole community. The floor was covered

with the slain. Nothing could allay the excitement. It spread like prairie fire. Men fitted their wagons with beds and provisions and travelled many miles, and camp meetings began. "Crops were left forgotten, cabins were deserted and in large settlements there did not remain one soul." The falling exercise prevailed especially at night. Nothing was then wanting that could strike terror into minds weak, timid and harassed. The converts exhibited astounding physical manifestations. Many fell, continued for hours breathless and would then rise shouting deliverance. Soon men and women fell in such numbers that it became impossible to move about without trampling them. Some would bound about like a live fish out of water. Many rolled over and over for hours at a time. It happened that an elder came back to his house at Cane Ridge and told what he had seen in Logan County, and immediately the same manifestations appeared as in the south of Kentucky. First two little girls were struck down, then a boisterous emotion followed, a singing ecstasy, and susceptible people on every side were over-wrought. For days there was an aggregated mass of humanity. Every extraordinary nervous condition was attributed to the mysterious and immediate agency of the divine. Three thousand people—one in every six—were struck to the ground at Cane Ridge. As the meetings grew more frequent, the nervous excitement assumed new and more terrible forms. A peculiar nervous and muscular manifestation known as the "jerks" was experienced by the converts. It began in the hand and spread rapidly to the feet. The victim shook in every joint. His head would be thrown from side to side so swiftly that the features would be blotted out and the hair made to snap. Finally the sufferer was dashed to the ground to bounce about like a ball. This nervous affection became a regular epidemic. From the nerves and muscles the disorder passed to the mind. Trances and visions followed such as one reads about in the accounts of Indian ghost dances. Barking at trees and the holy laugh were other phenomena of this religious mania. At last the emotions had so completely

swept away the element of control that gross immorality followed. Students of our national life are debating the question to-day, not without reason, whether the super-emotionalism and the fanaticism of this revival and its consequent weakening of the element of control in large districts of Kentucky is not largely responsible for the highly impassioned outbreaks of various kinds that so frequently take place in these very parts of Kentucky in our day.

Then came the great revival under Charles Finney. It began in the western part of New York State, a section of our country that has given rise to more than one super-emotional movement. It was in this region that Millerism arose, that the spiritual delusion under the Fox sisters had its origin, that gave birth to the Gospel of the Latter Day Saints under Joseph Smith. A large part of the population was of exceedingly primitive character, highly neurotic and suggestible. This was the tinder for the great revival fire under Charles Finney. The spell of Finney's personality was felt by all who met him. He was a man of brilliant parts. His influence was magnetic. He had a hypnotic eye. Men quaked under his gaze. His power of suggestion over men's minds was extraordinary. His manner was dramatic and sensational. He appealed to the fears of men, making their conscience quake by the most searching analysis of the motives of their hearts. He introduced the "anxious bench" and pressed the duty of immediate decision. He describes his preaching by saying, "The Lord let me *loose* upon them in a wonderful manner." His meetings were accompanied by violent bodily manifestations. His first convert was a young girl who fell from her seat under the power of his preaching, who had to be carried to her home and lay without the power of speech for sixteen hours. The scenes that followed baffle description. Whole communities came forward by the hundreds, pounding the anxious bench with great tumult and confusion. On one occasion so many people fell on the floor, says Finney, that "if I had had a sword in each hand I could not have cut them off their seats

as fast as they fell." His autobiography shows that whole sections of the country were so wrought up over the expectation of his coming that before he spoke a word, when he put in his appearance, they would fall under his sway. As to the result, we have on the one hand thousands of immediate conversions and on the other a state of affairs best described by Dr. Nevin in his "Anxious Bench Tract," when he says in 1843, "Years of faithful pastoral service on the part of a different class of ministers, working in a wholly different style have hardly yet sufficed to restore to something like spiritual fruitfulness and beauty the field in New York State over which Finney and his system passed as a wasting fire in the fulness of its strength."

Then came the Great Revival of 1857. The people of America were well-nigh crazed with financial fear because of commercial disaster. The treasury of the United States was emptied in the crash. The government was not able to pay its officers. The ruin of the country seemed complete. New York City especially seemed paralyzed with fear. Then the emotions generated by speculative excitement and intensified by panic depressions were transferred to religious subjects, and a remarkable revival followed close upon the heels of the panic. This revival was absolutely unique in the fact that it was not dependent on any one great leader and in the further fact that it was a transition from the old type of revival to a newer, quieter, saner type.

This American revival of 1857 spread to northern Ireland, where it had the Celtic temperament as its basis. From the very beginning there were physical manifestations, but these were of a passive nature. Scores of young women in factories were prostrated, and in Belfast particularly the sleeping phenomena occurred, the converts falling into slumber at will, waking a few days afterwards at a time they had set. The trance, the vision, sensory automatisms, sinking of muscular energy, were the prevailing type of manifestation in this revival.

Among recent revival movements in America none is more remarkable than that under Mr. Moody. He emancipated

religious evangelism from the Gospel of fear and preached the love of God with such tenderness and pathos as to magnetize his hearers. The great billows of his soul would break into a spray of tears till men would weep with him. He appealed less to dogmatic bias, and more to the distinctively ethical motives, and consequently little of the extreme forms of emotionality was found in his work. Most remarkable, however, and noteworthy is it that at the very summit of his powers he recognized the limitations of his method, and turned aside from revival work to engage in the systematic instruction and training of those already Christian.

In the Welsh revival of 1904 we have all the factors of a great religious awakening clearly at hand. The Welsh nature is peculiarly rich in sensibilities, exceptionally responsive to religious appeals and to the influence of music. Song often lifts an entire Welsh audience on a wave of feeling. Then, too, they are a secluded people, their horizon is limited. Especially is this the case among the thousands of colliers in south Wales. To this people there came one of the most striking personalities of our time, a young man named Evan Roberts, the son of a Welsh miner. He is a man of quiet, mystical temperament, a seer of visions. "One night he woke from his sleep," he says, "to find himself in the very presence of the Almighty God. For the space of four hours I was privileged to speak with him as a man speaks face to face with a friend. At five o'clock it seemed to me as if I again returned to earth. This continued every morning for four months." His presence is hypnotic. Over and over again we are told he would look fixedly in a certain direction and demand a convert, and every time a convert was discovered at the spot indicated. Each of these strange predictions was preceded by a trembling of the missioner's body and a painful contortion of the facial muscles. The people had been brought into that electrical frame of mind upon which the powerful and pure force of Roberts could play as upon an instrument of music. A young girl at a Christian Endeavor meeting was his first convert.

Forty thousand conversions followed. As to manifestations, many declared that they had seen visions. Thus we are told that a party of young men going along a road saw before them, rising above the hedge, a figure radiating light and transfixed by a shaft coming down from the sky. They knelt on the ground in the middle of the road and prayed, not in fear, but in the full conviction that they were in the presence of a heavenly visitant. This marvellous revival was noted for the irrepressible excitement and almost frenzied enthusiasm of the masses of the people in towns and villages throughout south Wales.

The revivals of recent years have somewhat modified their methods. The anxious bench has been superseded by the even more superficial method of putting all one's batteries to work with a view of getting a convert to rise where he is sitting, to lift his hand, to sign a card, or by some other feeble, unnatural, mechanical movement to indicate his immediate and unreserved surrender, giving what we believe is a totally false and weak idea of what really constitutes enlisting in the service of Christ. To gain this end protracted meetings are held, itinerant evangelists employed, blatant advertising engaged in, and hymns are sung that are but a jumble of pious ideas, one standard of spiritual experience is pressed indiscriminately on all persons alike by the affirmation and reiteration of the evangelist—and the twentieth century man is expected to go "clanging in stoga-boots into the holy of holies." We say this in full recognition of the earnestness and sincerity of many godly evangelists of our day.

II.

We have described up to this point the historic facts, factors, and phenomena of the modern religious revivals. How shall we explain or interpret these phenomena? There have been three methods of interpretation: (1) The exclusively supernatural, (2) the exclusively pathological, (3) the scientific.

1. The supernatural interpretation looks upon all revival phenomena, normal and abnormal, as the immediate signs of

the presence and favor of God. It looks upon the passional as the peculiar channel of divine communication. It views the unusual and mysterious as signs of another world—whether that unusual occur in the physical, mental or religious sphere. This is akin to the superstition that burns witches for diseases which medical science has not yet understood. To the superstitious mind all the mysterious manifestations connected with religious experience seem to be the work of demons or of the spirit of God. Physical manifestations are the sure sign of demoniac or divine power. There can be no doubt that much of the power of the old revival rested on this exclusively supernatural interpretation which the popular mind gave to certain physical and mental phenomena, just because they were mysterious and awe-inspiring. This type of mind still regards the revivals of history as the most eminent instance of the immediate divine presence vouchsafed to the world. One would think by hearing these interpreters that not only were revivals out of all course of nature, but that all the ordinary laws of the physical, mental, social universe were suspended in their favor. We are told that all the revival phenomena are the work of the Holy Ghost and therefore it is beyond human power to understand, interpret, produce or control them. Frankly, we believe this theory to be inadequate to explain all the phenomena. This does not mean, as you shall see in a moment, the elimination of the supernatural.

2. At the other extreme is the exclusively pathological theory. It regards all conversion and spiritual experience and revival phenomena as the most remarkable exhibition of morbid emotion or neurotics. It accounts for the whole thing by calling it a disease or a serious functional derangement of the nervous system, a condition, as Nietzsche calls it, of *nervus sympathicus*. This crass view of the medical materialist who refers all things in heaven and on earth to organic disposition, is both unworthy and inadequate.

3. Between these two methods, conserving the element of truth in each, there lies a third that we shall designate the

Scientific. It is only within the past decade that a scientific study of religious phenomena has been seriously attempted under men like James, Clark, Coe, Starbuck, Davenport, Leuba and others. The scientific study by no means excludes the Divine Spirit from religious experience, but it seeks to show that religious phenomena are more largely subject to natural laws and processes than men have dreamed. Certain phenomena which at one time were widely believed to be supernatural reveal information which fix them very definitely in the category of the natural. This does not mean that we would attempt to explain by natural laws all the mysteries of revival phenomena. There is a sense in which all the phenomena of the human mind, thought, feeling, and will, never reveal their secret. Religion is life and life has its eternal secret. But there are many phenomena of religious experience which can easily be taken out of the realm of the mysterious and the capricious and the superstitious and explained by perfectly natural, physical, psychical or social laws.

A religious revival from a scientific standpoint is a social movement. It is an outgrowth of man's social nature. The necessary antecedents of any social movement are, according to Professor Giddings, a consciousness of kind and a certain like-mindedness. By like-mindedness is meant the capacity for like response to the same stimulus. Like-mindedness may be sympathetic, formal or rational. The first is a simple combination of feelings on the part of a social group, the second refers to memories, traditions and habits that are held in common, the third expresses agreement of thought produced by rational reflection and is the highest mode of the social mind. The religious revival is a social movement on the part of individuals who are in a condition of sympathetic like-mindedness. Subjectively they are in a condition of suggestibility, imitativeness, imagination, and emotion. Objectively a social group in such a condition is apt to enter into what is known as impulsive social action. If a sufficient number in the group have strong powers of inhibition and hold themselves in restraint,

we have a deliberative assembly. But one of the characteristics of a group in a condition of sympathetic like-mindedness is that the instinctive nervous tendencies gain control over the rational and volitional, and deeds of hasty impulse rather than of calm judgment result. This is equally true in industrial, political, judicial or religious assemblies. The history of impulsive social action is an interesting and a disastrous one. Professor Giddings has carefully formulated certain laws that enter into all such action. There are three laws of impulsive social action: (1) The law of origin, (2) the law of extent and intensity, (3) the law of restraint. We shall apply these laws to religious revivals looked at as a form of impulsive social action.

1. The law of origin is that "Impulsive social action is commenced by those elements of the population that are least self-controlled." This law is demonstrated in two ways, historically and psychologically. The historical proof can be seen on every side. Men of thought and strong control may lay the plans for social movements, they may apply the stimulus, but the highly impulsive, the impressionable, the most nervously unstable and suggestible are always the first to act. In the long chronicles of history we find many examples of this law. The rise and conduct of the crusades under Peter the Hermit, Walter the Penniless, and Gottschalk, and the Children's Crusade, the events of the Reign of Terror in the French Revolution, the case of John Brown, the reign of the Commune in Paris in '71, many American riots, and the Armenian massacres of '94, all serve to demonstrate this law historically. Now, as to revivals, the facts show that the first victims of the great historic revivals were usually some single girls. Of course, the question that Dr. Kurtz asked of Dr. Nevin may be asked by some one: "Whether hysterical girls have not souls to be saved?" to which Dr. Nevin replied, "After due reflection it seems necessary to answer this searching interrogatory in the *affirmative*."

This law of origin may also be demonstrated psychologically. Who are they that first put into action the suggestion of a

leader in a crowd, who first give way to impulse? They are those whose spinal ganglia and lower brain centers are more highly developed than is the gray matter of the cortex where are found the higher rational and volitional faculties. Every student of psychology knows the simple process of nerve and brain reaction. Whenever a sensation passes along the afferent nerve it is carried to the spinal cord and the impulse to act is given over to the efferent nerve and a reflex which contracts the muscles is experienced. In all this there is no thought process or critical reasoning. But as the higher centers of control or the regulating powers of inhibition are developed the current of sensation is switched off into the thought centers of the brain, the sensation is detained, the whole cortical apparatus of the cerebrum is brought to bear upon the matter, deliberation takes place. Then the whole life of reflective action begins as over against the reflex impulsive action. Those who originate impulsive social action, the first to respond to an appeal for a mob-action, a revolution or a revival experience are they in whom these higher faculties of inhibition are least in control.

The impulsive is the lower and more primitive type of mind. In the evolution of the nervous system from instinctive life to rational life we have first the spinal cord as the supreme regulating center, then the medulla and the cord, then the basal ganglia, then the cerebrum. These regulating centers of control mark the progressive steps in the advance of intelligent life. They mark the gradation of the mind from the pure instinctive life of the animal to the rational life of highest civilization. Any one who studies the question of racial development or observes the several tendencies in mental evolution is driven to the conclusion that the impulsive is the lower type of mind. The difference between the primitive mind and the modern type of mind is the difference between the highly impulsive, emotional man with feeble reasoning power, the creature of suggestion, imitation, imagination, credulity, and the man not without emotion, but with deeper and more robust

emotion, controlled, however, by strong powers of inhibition. The primitive type of mind is indicative of the infancy of humanity. We still find it in the savage, the Indian, the negro, and the super-emotional elements of civilization. In all primitive cults the emotions are predominant. This is also true in varying proportions in the modern revival. Emotion runs the whole gamut from intense religious feeling to wildest frenzy in the revivals under consideration.

Here we have the natural cause of many of the religious phenomena whose mysteriousness used to be looked upon as evidence of the special interposition of the divine hand. Pure, uncontrolled religious emotion includes not only a psychic state but also a somatic state. The emotions profoundly affect the body. The physiological factor is not to be regarded with indifference. Emotions change the circulation, the respiration, the vibration of the whole organism. Its physiological accompaniment contains in varying proportion the two elements, depression and exaltation. Depression is related to fear. When the primitive instinct of fear is aroused, physical weakness follows, pallor, trembling, inability to speak. The extent to which depression grows depends on character, education, temperament, environment, and epoch of life. A more subjective form of fear consists purely in religious melancholia, the person believing himself to be lost or damned. The objective form so frequently found in the days of Edwards and Wesley is the demoniac melancholia, the delusion of possession, hallucination, etc. The terrible appeals to fear in the early revival and the vivid pictures of hell and judgment and doom, are an adequate explanation of the most serious bodily manifestations of early revivals.

Then there is the condition of exaltation which is related to joy. To the manifestation of this sentiment belong the mechanical exaltation produced by the Indian dance, the rhythmical music of primitive tribes, the toxic effects of the wine of the ancient Bacchanals, the exaltation of fakirs and dervishes. These are, of course, the most grossly materialistic

forms of exaltation. The collective excitement of pilgrimages and revivals produced by artificial means are of the same order of exaltation. They are necessary conditions of intense emotion. When they become chronic they enter the region of pathology. Ecstasy follows. When the ecstatic state is attended by unconsciousness it becomes catalepsy and all sensory activity is suspended. The phenomena are not due to divine interpositions. It is not the spirit of God working extraordinarily but the natural laws of emotion that account for physical manifestations of depression and exaltation. These phenomena always affect first the most susceptible, those who are most primitive in their reflexes, the impulsive rather than the deliberative, the lower rather than the higher type of mind.

2. The second great law of impulsive social action is that of its growth, the law of extent and intensity. It is as follows: "Impulsive social action tends to extend and intensify in a geometrical progression." This law follows from the sympathetic character of the movement. Each individual subject to a wave of feeling and impulse is a transmitter of impulse to others, and as to the increase in intensity we have the truth that the emotional reaction of many minds acts upon each individual mind. How this law works becomes clearer if we consider severally the influences at work in the spread of any impulsive social movement. (a) There is the individual influence on individual known as the law of imitation. (b) There is the individual influence on the individual or on the mass known as the law of suggestion. (c) There is the influence of the mass on the individual known as the law of mob-mind. These three principles have entered largely into the growth and the intensity of revivals.

(a) What has imitation to do with the spread of revivals? Let us see. A repetition, conscious or unconscious, by one individual of any act of another individual is imitation. This is a matter so familiar to us as to be given little thought. Yet the great French thinker, Tarde, has declared it to be the primordial social law, the fundamental factor of all social activi-

ity. Whether we concede that or not, we are compelled to grant that the principle of imitation lies at the basis of all spread of feeling or action, that from every individual modes of thought, feeling, and action spread as waves from a center of disturbance. Any act or expression of feeling is a stimulus to the nerve centers that perceive it. Unless this action is inhibited by the will or by counter stimulation it discharges itself in movements that are a close copy of the original. Imitations may be those of custom or they may be those of mode. Fashions, fads, revolutions, and revivals are mode imitations. In the absence of interference they spread in geometrical progression. This accounts for the extreme rapidity with which new words, panics, revolutions, fads, and fashions travel. This is a factor, too, in the spread of revivals. This accounts for the similarity in physical manifestations often seen in revivals. Motor impulses diffuse themselves with great facility. Bodily movements spread rapidly. Feelings spread more rapidly even than ideas. The hope of a "boom" and the terror of a panic are examples. In accounting for the rapid growth and the similarity of manifestations in religious revivals due account must be made of the truth that impulsive social action propagates itself through imitation in a geometrical progression like waves of light or sound.

(b) Again, the law of suggestion enters into the growth of religious revivals, and has much to do with the nature of their phenomena. Baldwin in his "Psychology" defines suggestion as the "abrupt entrance from without into consciousness of an idea or image which tends to produce the muscular and volitional effects which ordinarily follow upon its presence." Stimuli from within we call impulses, those reaching us from without we call suggestions. Suggestions are real forces. The power to withstand them is the will. If they meet no resistance they enact themselves. A person is said to be suggestible when he responds unconsciously to an idea as all people respond automatically in reflex action to a

sensation. Suggestibility predominates in the animal world, especially among monkeys and sheep. So the minds of the lower races of men are like wax. There are no counteracting ideas in the primitive mind; the idea that is there has everything its own way. Suggestibility is at its maximum in young children. The sanguine and melancholic temperament are more suggestible than the choleric; the Celtic race more suggestible than the Saxon. Women are more suggestible than men. Among the Indian ghost dancers young women are usually the first to be affected. The same is true in revivals. Starbuck shows that six times as many women as men are converted in public crowds. Ellis in his scientific study of "Man and Woman" shows that women are more hypnotizable than men; that in women the stirrings of the inferior nervous centers are not so firmly controlled by the supreme center as in man, hence they are more suggestible and emotional.

Now, the power of suggestion has been a great force in the production of revival experiences. There is a very complete correlation between the suggestibility of persons and their religious experience. The striking psychic manifestations of revivals are frequently simply of a hypnotic kind. Take the manifestations of "power" under Wesley, when men and women would cry out and fall unconscious. To modern psychology it is perfectly plain that this "power" was induced, not by divine interposition, but by hypnotic process. Under the influence of excitement a case of hallucination or catalepsy occurred. Those who saw it or heard of it were distressed lest the same mysterious power strike them. Thus fear acted as a suggestion and the susceptible ones soon fell.

Most frequently the suggestion comes from the revivalist himself. Take the modern revival as an example. The expectation of people is wrought up by weeks of elaborate preparation. The attention is fixed on some one subject, hymns that do not call forth any thought are sung and re-sung, an appeal from a leader of undoubted magnetism follows, an appeal filled with vivid imagination and strong feeling, and

the result is that the unstable element is at once in a state of mind favorable to suggestion. Then they are asked to do the very last thing that emotionally inclined persons ought to do, viz., to lay aside their will. Perfect self-surrender is asked for. Then the suggestion is made. "Raise the hand! Rise! Rise!" Repetitious phrases are used. "There's another." "One more saved." "See them coming." Do we realize to what extent this whole method is a hypnotization of weak and recalcitrant wills. There are only too many passive suggestibles in the world with whom any implanted idea leads at once to impulsive fulfilment. This accounts for the large number of lapses among converts, and for the proportionately meager permanent results of revival effort. There are victims of suggestion who are converted and re-converted at every revival. There is much so-called conversion, which is really a hypnotic process that never touches ethical or spiritual life at all. When the temporary stimulation is removed the reaction comes. I wish space would permit me to quote the concrete confessions as given by Starbuck of those who were brought for the time under the sway of the excitement and the hypnotic influence of a revival and afterwards when reaction and reflection came looked back on their experience with shame and repugnance. One of them called it a "gold brick deal." This principle of hypnotic suggestion explains why often men of superficial character and ability have such mysterious influence over the revival crowd. Dr. Buckley wrote a few years ago an account of a noted criminal who by this same method caused almost an entire revival audience to be struck down under the influence of his sermon as though by the power of God, and later confessed himself to have been a mesmeric fraud.

The employment of fear as the supreme motive has largely passed from the modern revival. The hypnotic feature has not passed away. The suggestibility highly wrought upon by the revivalist remains. Now, suggestion and the hypnotic process are not bad in themselves. But they are not in any sense a spiritual power. The phenomena produced by them

are not special evidences of the immediate presence of God. They are functions of the human mind. The hypnotic process is not one of the highest functions of the mind, either. It is primarily an animal means of fascination. Davenport compares it to the power "the feline employs upon the helpless bird, and the Indian medicine man upon the ghost dance votary." To use it upon susceptible women and little children is mentally, morally, and spiritually injurious. Suggestion will bless mankind only as it comes under the calm domination of reason and will.

(c) We have considered the influence of the individual on the individual and on the mass. Let us now look at the influence of the mass on the individual. Durkheim makes the ultimate social phenomenon to consist in the social pressure, the coercive power which many minds make upon any one mind. He calls it the intimidation by the mass, the influence of mere numbers against a helpless individual. Le Bon views this same thought from the standpoint of the psychology of the crowd: "Whoever be the individuals composing it, however like or unlike be their mode of life, their occupations, their character, or their intelligence, the fact that they have been transformed into a crowd puts them in possession of a sort of collective mind which makes them feel, think, and act in a manner quite different from that in which each individual of them would feel, think, and act were he in a state of isolation." The individual in a psychologic crowd is one thing; out of it he is another. Individuals in a crowd are just as cells which constitute a living body and form by their union a new being with characteristics different from those possessed by the individual cells. The acts of a crowd are the outcome of the subconscious stratum of their instincts, passions, and feelings. That which unites the psychologic crowd is not reason, but feeling; for feeling is the broad bond of nature. The crowd is the great driving force of impulsive social action. Individuality is wilted, excitement heightens suggestibility, feeling is intensified, reflection and reason are in abeyance. A psycho-

logic crowd acts more under the influence of the spinal cord than of the brain. It is at the mercy of external exciting causes. Stimulation immediately brings action. The individual possesses the capacity of dominating his reflex actions, the psychologic crowd is void of this capacity. It is credulous. It thinks in images. It is moved by improbable stories. It succumbs to exaggeration, affirmation and repetition. If it reasons at all it does so by analogy and generalizes from particular cases. The power of contagion in a crowd is strong, contagion not only of certain opinions, but especially of certain modes of feeling. Even the unsympathetic may be swept off their feet by this crowd contagion. Thus law-abiding persons have been swept into the unlawful actions of a mob, and men of critical mind have been drawn into the revival maelstrom. A psychologic crowd is not formed in a moment. It takes some time for the contagion to work. The revivalist does not expect much response during his first half hour. But soon the growing pressure of the mass on the individual so contract his consciousness to a single point that it takes less suggestion than usual to start an impulse. The fascinating power of a crowd for the individual is greater than most men suspect. This is the secret of many a revolution, a mob, or a revival.

It is a strange fact that the greatest epidemics of crowd emotion have occurred in rural communities rather than in large cities. The rural community is relatively homogeneous and an exciting event or suggestion that moves one individual is almost certain to move others. A city population is more composite. It is not so likely to respond to like stimuli. This may have something to do with the great revivals in rural communities under Wesley, Finney, Roberts, and others. At best, the psychologic crowd is too ephemeral for permanent influences on ethical life. The crowd pressure does not last long. The bond dissolves, the crowd scatters, the revival breaks up and the converts come to the point where for the first time reflection begins. But in considering the temporary spread and the emotional intensity of any revival due account must

be made of this second law of impulsive social action, the law that refers to growth by geometrical progression through imitation, suggestion, and mob-mind.

3. The law of restraint is that "deliberation as a habit of mind is the only check to impulsive social action." As individuals are trained in the habit of control, subordinating feeling to rational considerations, impulsive social actions are held in restraint. This is the only safety of a democracy. Only as the greatest respect for intellectual activity and for self-control is maintained is the danger of impulse in a democracy prevented from becoming threatening. A nation that gets its political life solely by impulse and that is undermining its powers of rational control is doomed. He who reads Lecky can easily see how the errors of a democracy are caused by the acceptance of the leadership of unrestrained emotion on the part of a nation. The same principle holds in religion. A method of religion that demands of men that they yield without question and thought to impassioned appeals in the crisis of their spiritual life is, we believe, dangerous to the individual, the church, and the nation. The very last thing that an impulsive man needs is a stirring of the emotion. The very first thing that he needs is a religious discipline that will strengthen his will to keep passions in check and to build up piece by piece a new set of moral and spiritual habits. The greatest danger of the whole method is that it does not take the proper function of the will into account. What makes sin and the sinner? What is the crime of the drunkard? It is yielding to impulse rather than to reason. It is lack of inhibition. What he needs is not a sudden and profound upheaval of his soul, but a method that will keep him in the way of a more deliberate and controlled manner of living. He is to be challenged not to an impulsive self-surrender, but to a deliberate devotion of self to a higher life. What is needed by a boy or girl just entering adolescence, a period when the whole physical and mental nature undergoes transformation characterized by stirring emotion, apprehension and sensitiveness, is not the

excitement of a revival, nor the singing of sensuous religious hymns, but a guiding hand, a wise religious leader who through careful instruction and deliberate strengthening of moral and spiritual habits will cause the young soul to unfold and to blossom forth with all the quietness, gentleness, sweetness, and beauty of a rose. What this nation needs, crazed as it is in many quarters by frenzied feeling that ever and anon bursts forth in mob and riot, is certainly not a method of religion that lacks the elements of rational self-restraint. The danger is that a people who get their religion by impulse rather than by rational control will soon degenerate to the point where they will get their political life in the same way.

For these and many other reasons, the conviction is growing among thoughtful men that the typical religious revival has had its day. This conviction has come gradually but surely. The conception of God's immanence, the principle of growth, the fundamental ethical relation of man to God, have all helped to bring about the conviction that God's method with men is that of building up intelligent volition through divine unfolding. They see that it is perilous to the whole cause of the Christian religion to take a relation as intensely practical and personal as religion ought to be and to look upon it in a superficial, mechanical and magical fashion. The modern mind resents the obtrusiveness of the revival method. The relation of a man to his God is so deep, personal, intimate, and sacred a thing that the self-respecting man shrinks from dragging it out into the public gaze. No man of really fine feeling carries his heart upon his coat sleeve or flaunts to the crowd the most sacred things in his own life, nor dare he find it in his heart to press or demand such a public revelation from others. A man who deeply reverences personality will not do that. The more deeply sensitive he is to the eternal significance of the religion of the considerate Jesus, the less will he be inclined to force his way into the secret recesses of another's heart. If there is one thing the man of fine grain dreads in himself and in others, it is this trifling play upon, this ruthless overriding of, the per-

sonality of another. A deepening sense is growing upon thoughtful men of the sacredness of the personal relation between a man and his God. It is not a thing for public gaze. It is not a question solved in a moment by the waving of a handkerchief. It is not a matter of unrestrained emotion or dramatic convulsion. The kingdom of God came not as the Jews expected through some cataclysmic stroke out of the sky. It came as the seed that bore first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear. It grew as all fellowship grows, as all true relationships ripen. See how unobtrusively God works in human hearts! See how unobtrusively Jesus led men into the Kingdom! If we understand the method of Jesus aright it conforms to the truth promulgated by modern psychology that strong character appears normally in the growth of calm and disciplined habits of religion. The secret of the Kingdom lies in the little child and the principle of growth.

With the passing away of the revival will evangelism disappear? By no means. A new type of evangelism will come. It will be the evangelism of Jesus. There will be less effort to gather immense crowds. It will know nothing of emotional stampeding. There will be no overriding of the will and the reason. There will be no obtrusive pressing of the sacred matter of man's relation to God under the spell of excitement or contagion. Its message will appeal not to fear, but to love, a love that is ethical and spiritual and that will inspire men to action. It will be social as well as individual. John Bunyan and the city of destruction will be heard of less, and John Howard and the city of God will be heard of more. The purpose of the message will be to give men moments of insight, times of vision, fresh awakening to the significance of life. There may be no converts as far as the raising of hands is concerned, but that Kingdom of God which cometh not by observation, but which consists in the influence of personal life and character will surely be coming.

This new evangelism will ground itself on the great truth of Christian nurture. It will seek through careful, prayerful

Christian training to conform the whole man more and more to the Christian ideal. It will put a new emphasis on the teaching side in all religious work. It will regard the ideal Christian life as the product of the gradual dawning of a sweet and trustful God consciousness in the minds and hearts of men. To this end it will foster religious culture in sound Christian homes. It will look upon the religious instruction of the Sunday School as worthy of the best pedagogical ideals of the twentieth century. It will see to it that those who instruct the young in Biblical knowledge are at least as well trained as those who instruct them in secular lore. It will emphasize the moral value of the library and the press. It will see to it that the foundations of morality and religion are taught in the common schools. It will not be content to teach a chosen few the answers of a sixteenth century catechism for a few months in a year. Such a method is as superficial and inadequate as the other, not because it is a wrong method, but because it touches life at but one point and one period. The great religious movement of the twentieth century will lie in the direction of renewed fervor in the interests of Christian training. There are signs of the times on every hand. The Bible is studied and taught as never before. Volumes on religious instruction are coming from the press yearly. Teachers are being trained. The Bible is being taught in college and university. Young people, instead of trying to get up revivals, are organizing mission study classes. Revivalistic churches are formulating catechisms. One of the most far-reaching movements of modern times is the Religious Educational Association of America. All these things mark the dawn of a new day in religious evangelism and religious education. James Russell Lowell, speaking of the religion of the American of the future in his poem on "The Cathedral," says that it will be more than

"an ambulance
To fetch life's wounded and malingers in,
Scorned by the strong."

No, the religion of the twentieth century will not be "scorned by the strong." It will be rugged and active. It will minister to strength, to happiness, to character, to absorbing work. It will give rational attention to the great spiritual realities, and will find its peace and its joy in the doing of the will of God.

ALLEGTON, PA.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

DAVENPORT. "Primitive Traits in Religious Revival." Macmillan.

GIDDINGS. "Elements of Sociology." Macmillan.

ROSS. "Social Psychology." Macmillan.

LE BON. "The Crowd." Fisher Unwin.

TARDE. "Laws of Imitation." Henry Holt.

STARBUCK. "Psychology of Religion." Scribner's.

JAMES. "Varieties of Religious Belief." Longmans, Green & Co.

JAMES. "Ethical Significance of Religious Revivals." *International Journal of Ethics*, Vol. 16.

HOOK. "Religious Revival and Social Evolution." *Westminster Review*.

DAVENPORT. "Revivals and the New Evangelism." *Outlook*, Vol. 79.

COE. "The Spiritual Life." Eaton & Mains.

"The Religion of a Mature Mind." Revell.

Reports of the Religious Educational Association.

KING. "Christian Training and the Revival as Methods of Converting Men." Y. M. C. A., Chicago.

BEARDSLEY. "History of American Revivals." American Tract Society.

Wesley's "Journal."

TH. RIBOT. "The Psychology of the Emotions." Scribner's.

SIDIS. "The Psychology of Suggestion."

BACON. "History of American Christianity."

III.

EVANGELISM IN THE REFORMED CHURCHES.¹

BY THE REV. HENRY COLLIN MINTON, D.D., LL.D.

The special committee appointed one year ago to ascertain and report upon the state of the churches represented in this body, as related to evangelistic work, has been embarrassed by the magnitude and many-sidedness of the task assigned to it. We have been impressed with the thought that, in the larger interpretation of our duty, we should have inquired into all the missionary activities of the various churches. Obviously, however, this was not intended. Although missionary work is primarily and preëminently evangelistic work, and although we have found a disposition in some of the churches to lodge the control of evangelistic work in already established boards and agencies, yet the committee interprets its work to be that of inquiring into the means and methods employed in the local churches in reaching the unevangelized with the gospel, and in bringing the unconverted to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ.

It is clear that in most of the churches there has been in recent years a deepening consciousness of the unrivalled importance of this work, and of the imperfect manner in which it has been performed. This consciousness is largely independent of the question whether or not our faith and polity are well suited for such a work. The chief end of the church cannot be higher or lower or other than that of her Great Head, and He it is who said of Himself that He came to seek and to save the lost. The feeling has taken strong hold upon many in our churches that in a commendable zeal for social reform,

¹ This paper was presented to the Western Section of the Executive Committee of the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance, at its meeting in the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City, in February, 1908.

or for civic righteousness, or for purity of doctrine, or for institutional integrity, or for ethical achievement, or for humanitarian interests there is grave peril that the prime motive for the church's existence and maintenance should be lost sight of, namely, the saving of lost men and women from sin through faith in Jesus Christ by the gracious power of the living God. So many are the blessed indirect benefactions of religion, that the central nucleus of them all is sometimes overlooked and, accordingly, it is forgotten that just as the branches derive their life from the stem, so these incidental interests and movements can be healthy and permanent only where there is a deep, strong spiritual life at the core. We do not believe that we over-state the truth in saying that in all the legitimate activities of the Christian church, evangelical, educational, aggressive or eleemosynary, the one worthy motive and enduring inspiration must be always evangelistic.

Few are the communities to-day, either rural or urban, in which there is not a large margin of population unreached by the gospel and practically untouched by the church. If we consider the element, not inconsiderable in many towns and cities, who avowedly announce themselves as hostile to the church; and then if we consider the growing number of those who, although actively interested in noble and perhaps Christian enterprises, still studiously avoid allying themselves with any effort that is under a distinctively church control; and then if we consider again that very large neutral element who either do or do not themselves occasionally attend upon the services of the sanctuary, and who, however amiable and respectable in themselves, yet neither profess nor manifest any personal interest in the saving work for which the church exists, we cannot escape the conviction that the church has not yet achieved the signal success to which it is predestined, and that the infusion of a new impulse if not of a new life must be the condition of the fulfillment of its high hopes and purposes.

Our churches are conservative. They are chary of the bizarre and the sensational. They exalt the stated means of

grace and ordinances of the house of God. They suspect any immediate result that has been achieved at the cost of decorum or at the sacrifice of becoming reverence for the sanctities of religion. This very proper attitude finds expression in the replies of several of the churches; and yet we find at the same time that the leaven of uneasiness has been at work. Disquietude has resulted from the clearly observed fact that extra-ecclesiastical evangelism is entering the field and more and more doing the very work which the church itself was commissioned to do. The Young Men's Christian Association, the Salvation Army, Rescue Missions, and other works of many kinds, while in spirit friendly to the church without whose support indeed they could not exist, are coming to be regarded by many as rivals of the church itself. Meanwhile the church in many places has been making feeble inroads upon the ranks of the unchurched. The average annual increase in the membership of our churches, from their own baptized children, from their Sunday School classes and from all other sources without has, at the very best, not much exceeded six per cent. of their entire membership. Counting deaths and defections, the church in many instances has not been much more than holding her own. Certainly this is not taking the world for Christ.

Moved by all these things, a number of our churches in the last few years have appointed committees especially charged with stimulating and directing evangelistic effort. In the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, this committee, with Mr. John H. Converse as chairman and the Reverend J. Wilbur Chapman, D.D., as corresponding secretary, by distributing literature, holding conferences and conducting great evangelistic meetings, has unquestionably accomplished a great work with far-reaching influence and blessed results. A number of the other churches, notably the United Presbyterian Church and the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America have had similar committees at work. The Presbyterian Church in the United States has a committee in its field

directing its evangelistic work, but this committee is independent of its General Assembly. The Church of Canada expresses itself as not zealously devoted to evangelistic efforts and relies largely upon the old-fashioned custom of special services just preceding the regular communion in which neighboring pastors assist the pastor at home. A systematic canvass of the parish is made periodically by the pastor himself, and it is believed, in avoiding emotional excitement, fewer lapses are recorded later on.

In the Reformed Church (German) in the United States we are told that emphasis is put upon the "catechetical system" to the exclusion of the revivalistic method"; and if there be those who regard this as a mistake, we may well consider whether in some of the churches the other extreme has not been fallen into, namely, that of relying exclusively upon the Sabbath School which, for doctrinal grounding, is wholly inadequate and which is often overshadowed as an educational factor by the undue preponderance of the evangelistic idea and method.

Your committee beg leave to call your attention to the following reflections upon this subject:

1. We are convinced that there is no integral lack in the organized equipment of our churches for the successful prosecution of evangelistic work. The Presbyterian polity is flexible and adjustable to the ever-changing conditions of society. Her doctrine may be only the dead husks of orthodoxy; but, vitalized by the spirit of Him who is Himself the Truth, it has demonstrated again and again in the history of the Reformed churches its vitality and virility in the work of saving men. Ever loyal to the Bible as the inspired Word of God, it calls sin sin and scorns the glossing over of its essential sinfulness; it presents the awful tragedies of death which sin brings to men and points to the Tragedy of Calvary with its divinely atoning sacrifice as the only deliverance from its curse; it honors the Sovereign Spirit who works when and where and how He pleases, as the only author of all re-creating and sanctifying work in men; and it points the way to an open field of opportunity and activity and

service wherein every redeemed child of God may develop his own spiritual life and carry the gospel that saved himself to others who need it as he once needed it, but have not yet felt its changing power. We do not believe that the exigent demands of the twentieth century, with conditions which may indeed entail certain incidental changes upon the conventional means and methods of ordinary church work, call for any radical or constitutional changes in any of the Reformed churches, in order that they may go forward to a larger and more fruitful work of winning lost men to Christ and bringing them into the Kingdom of God.

2. The question emerges whether or not the laity of the churches may not possess certain latent possibilities for evangelistic service heretofore unutilized. Our churches are all at one in holding to the parity of the ministry. This is a cardinal principle of the Reformed polity. The ordained ministry is not more clearly distinguished from the laity than it is homogeneous and of equal rank. And yet, on the one hand, with a marked decline in the number of forthcoming ministers and a dearth upon the churches already not much short of disastrous, and, on the other hand, with the wide dissemination of Biblical training and learning, and with the development in our churches of unordained men who indisputably possess both the graces of speech and the grace of God, it becomes a practical question how far the churches should go in giving official sanction to the public utterances of unordained preachers of the gospel. The Presbyterian Church of the United States of America has a constitutional provision for local evangelists, licensed by the Presbytery for one year subject to renewal, and if renewed for four consecutive years, the experience thus gained may be taken as that of a novitiate for the ministry and, after a satisfactory examination upon the equivalent of a three years' study of theology and kindred subjects, the novitiate may be ordained to the full gospel ministry. The Presbyterian Church of Canada has made a still further concession to the exigencies of frontier work, and by special act of its

sonality of another. A deepening sense is growing upon thoughtful men of the sacredness of the personal relation between a man and his God. It is not a thing for public gaze. It is not a question solved in a moment by the waving of a handkerchief. It is not a matter of unrestrained emotion or dramatic convulsion. The kingdom of God came not as the Jews expected through some cataclysmic stroke out of the sky. It came as the seed that bore first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear. It grew as all fellowship grows, as all true relationships ripen. See how unobtrusively God works in human hearts! See how unobtrusively Jesus led men into the Kingdom! If we understand the method of Jesus aright it conforms to the truth promulgated by modern psychology that strong character appears normally in the growth of calm and disciplined habits of religion. The secret of the Kingdom lies in the little child and the principle of growth.

With the passing away of the revival will evangelism disappear? By no means. A new type of evangelism will come. It will be the evangelism of Jesus. There will be less effort to gather immense crowds. It will know nothing of emotional stampeding. There will be no overriding of the will and the reason. There will be no obtrusive pressing of the sacred matter of man's relation to God under the spell of excitement or contagion. Its message will appeal not to fear, but to love, a love that is ethical and spiritual and that will inspire men to action. It will be social as well as individual. John Bunyan and the city of destruction will be heard of less, and John Howard and the city of God will be heard of more. The purpose of the message will be to give men moments of insight, times of vision, fresh awakening to the significance of life. There may be no converts as far as the raising of hands is concerned, but that Kingdom of God which cometh not by observation, but which consists in the influence of personal life and character will surely be coming.

This new evangelism will ground itself on the great truth of Christian nurture. It will seek through careful, prayerful

Christian training to conform the whole man more and more to the Christian ideal. It will put a new emphasis on the teaching side in all religious work. It will regard the ideal Christian life as the product of the gradual dawning of a sweet and trustful God consciousness in the minds and hearts of men. To this end it will foster religious culture in sound Christian homes. It will look upon the religious instruction of the Sunday School as worthy of the best pedagogical ideals of the twentieth century. It will see to it that those who instruct the young in Biblical knowledge are at least as well trained as those who instruct them in secular lore. It will emphasize the moral value of the library and the press. It will see to it that the foundations of morality and religion are taught in the common schools. It will not be content to teach a chosen few the answers of a sixteenth century catechism for a few months in a year. Such a method is as superficial and inadequate as the other, not because it is a wrong method, but because it touches life at but one point and one period. The great religious movement of the twentieth century will lie in the direction of renewed fervor in the interests of Christian training. There are signs of the times on every hand. The Bible is studied and taught as never before. Volumes on religious instruction are coming from the press yearly. Teachers are being trained. The Bible is being taught in college and university. Young people, instead of trying to get up revivals, are organizing mission study classes. Revivalistic churches are formulating catechisms. One of the most far-reaching movements of modern times is the Religious Educational Association of America. All these things mark the dawn of a new day in religious evangelism and religious education. James Russell Lowell, speaking of the religion of the American of the future in his poem on "The Cathedral," says that it will be more than

"an ambulance
To fetch life's wounded and malingeringers in,
Scorned by the strong."

No, the religion of the twentieth century will not be "scorned by the strong." It will be rugged and active. It will minister to strength, to happiness, to character, to absorbing work. It will give rational attention to the great spiritual realities, and will find its peace and its joy in the doing of the will of God.

ALLENTOWN, PA.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

DAVENPORT. "Primitive Traits in Religious Revival." Macmillan.

GIDDINGS. "Elements of Sociology." Macmillan.

ROSS. "Social Psychology." Macmillan.

LE BON. "The Crowd." Fisher Unwin.

TARDE. "Laws of Imitation." Henry Holt.

STARBUCK. "Psychology of Religion." Scribner's.

JAMES. "Varieties of Religious Belief." Longmans, Green & Co.

JAMES. "Ethical Significance of Religious Revivals." *International Journal of Ethics*, Vol. 16.

HOOK. "Religious Revival and Social Evolution." *Westminster Review*.

DAVENPORT. "Revivals and the New Evangelism." *Outlook*, Vol. 79.

COE. "The Spiritual Life." Eaton & Mains.

"The Religion of a Mature Mind." Revell.

Reports of the Religious Educational Association.

KING. "Christian Training and the Revival as Methods of Converting Men." Y. M. C. A., Chicago.

BEARDSLEY. "History of American Revivals." American Tract Society.

Wesley's "Journal."

TH. RIBOT. "The Psychology of the Emotions." Scribner's.

SIDIS. "The Psychology of Suggestion."

BACON. "History of American Christianity."

III.

EVANGELISM IN THE REFORMED CHURCHES.¹

BY THE REV. HENRY COLLIN MINTON, D.D., LL.D.

The special committee appointed one year ago to ascertain and report upon the state of the churches represented in this body, as related to evangelistic work, has been embarrassed by the magnitude and many-sidedness of the task assigned to it. We have been impressed with the thought that, in the larger interpretation of our duty, we should have inquired into all the missionary activities of the various churches. Obviously, however, this was not intended. Although missionary work is primarily and preëminently evangelistic work, and although we have found a disposition in some of the churches to lodge the control of evangelistic work in already established boards and agencies, yet the committee interprets its work to be that of inquiring into the means and methods employed in the local churches in reaching the unevangelized with the gospel, and in bringing the unconverted to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ.

It is clear that in most of the churches there has been in recent years a deepening consciousness of the unrivalled importance of this work, and of the imperfect manner in which it has been performed. This consciousness is largely independent of the question whether or not our faith and polity are well suited for such a work. The chief end of the church cannot be higher or lower or other than that of her Great Head, and He it is who said of Himself that He came to seek and to save the lost. The feeling has taken strong hold upon many in our churches that in a commendable zeal for social reform,

¹This paper was presented to the Western Section of the Executive Committee of the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance, at its meeting in the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City, in February, 1908.

or for civic righteousness, or for purity of doctrine, or for institutional integrity, or for ethical achievement, or for humanitarian interests there is grave peril that the prime motive for the church's existence and maintenance should be lost sight of, namely, the saving of lost men and women from sin through faith in Jesus Christ by the gracious power of the living God. So many are the blessed indirect benefactions of religion, that the central nucleus of them all is sometimes overlooked and, accordingly, it is forgotten that just as the branches derive their life from the stem, so these incidental interests and movements can be healthy and permanent only where there is a deep, strong spiritual life at the core. We do not believe that we over-state the truth in saying that in all the legitimate activities of the Christian church, evangelical, educational, aggressive or eleemosynary, the one worthy motive and enduring inspiration must be always evangelistic.

Few are the communities to-day, either rural or urban, in which there is not a large margin of population unreached by the gospel and practically untouched by the church. If we consider the element, not inconsiderable in many towns and cities, who avowedly announce themselves as hostile to the church; and then if we consider the growing number of those who, although actively interested in noble and perhaps Christian enterprises, still studiously avoid allying themselves with any effort that is under a distinctively church control; and then if we consider again that very large neutral element who either do or do not themselves occasionally attend upon the services of the sanctuary, and who, however amiable and respectable in themselves, yet neither profess nor manifest any personal interest in the saving work for which the church exists, we cannot escape the conviction that the church has not yet achieved the signal success to which it is predestined, and that the infusion of a new impulse if not of a new life must be the condition of the fulfillment of its high hopes and purposes.

Our churches are conservative. They are chary of the bizarre and the sensational. They exalt the stated means of

grace and ordinances of the house of God. They suspect any immediate result that has been achieved at the cost of decorum or at the sacrifice of becoming reverence for the sanctities of religion. This very proper attitude finds expression in the replies of several of the churches; and yet we find at the same time that the leaven of uneasiness has been at work. Disquietude has resulted from the clearly observed fact that extra-ecclesiastical evangelism is entering the field and more and more doing the very work which the church itself was commissioned to do. The Young Men's Christian Association, the Salvation Army, Rescue Missions, and other works of many kinds, while in spirit friendly to the church without whose support indeed they could not exist, are coming to be regarded by many as rivals of the church itself. Meanwhile the church in many places has been making feeble inroads upon the ranks of the unchurched. The average annual increase in the membership of our churches, from their own baptized children, from their Sunday School classes and from all other sources without has, at the very best, not much exceeded six per cent. of their entire membership. Counting deaths and defections, the church in many instances has not been much more than holding her own. Certainly this is not taking the world for Christ.

Moved by all these things, a number of our churches in the last few years have appointed committees especially charged with stimulating and directing evangelistic effort. In the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, this committee, with Mr. John H. Converse as chairman and the Reverend J. Wilbur Chapman, D.D., as corresponding secretary, by distributing literature, holding conferences and conducting great evangelistic meetings, has unquestionably accomplished a great work with far-reaching influence and blessed results. A number of the other churches, notably the United Presbyterian Church and the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America have had similar committees at work. The Presbyterian Church in the United States has a committee in its field

directing its evangelistic work, but this committee is independent of its General Assembly. The Church of Canada expresses itself as not zealously devoted to evangelistic efforts and relies largely upon the old-fashioned custom of special services just preceding the regular communion in which neighboring pastors assist the pastor at home. A systematic canvass of the parish is made periodically by the pastor himself, and it is believed, in avoiding emotional excitement, fewer lapses are recorded later on.

In the Reformed Church (German) in the United States we are told that emphasis is put upon the "catechetical system" to the exclusion of the revivalistic method"; and if there be those who regard this as a mistake, we may well consider whether in some of the churches the other extreme has not been fallen into, namely, that of relying exclusively upon the Sabbath School which, for doctrinal grounding, is wholly inadequate and which is often overshadowed as an educational factor by the undue preponderance of the evangelistic idea and method.

Your committee beg leave to call your attention to the following reflections upon this subject:

1. We are convinced that there is no integral lack in the organized equipment of our churches for the successful prosecution of evangelistic work. The Presbyterian polity is flexible and adjustable to the ever-changing conditions of society. Her doctrine may be only the dead husks of orthodoxy; but, vitalized by the spirit of Him who is Himself the Truth, it has demonstrated again and again in the history of the Reformed churches its vitality and virility in the work of saving men. Ever loyal to the Bible as the inspired Word of God, it calls sin sin and scorns the glossing over of its essential sinfulness; it presents the awful tragedies of death which sin brings to men and points to the Tragedy of Calvary with its divinely atoning sacrifice as the only deliverance from its curse; it honors the Sovereign Spirit who works when and where and how He pleases, as the only author of all re-creating and sanctifying work in men; and it points the way to an open field of opportunity and activity and

service wherein every redeemed child of God may develop his own spiritual life and carry the gospel that saved himself to others who need it as he once needed it, but have not yet felt its changing power. We do not believe that the exigent demands of the twentieth century, with conditions which may indeed entail certain incidental changes upon the conventional means and methods of ordinary church work, call for any radical or constitutional changes in any of the Reformed churches, in order that they may go forward to a larger and more fruitful work of winning lost men to Christ and bringing them into the Kingdom of God.

2. The question emerges whether or not the laity of the churches may not possess certain latent possibilities for evangelistic service heretofore unutilized. Our churches are all at one in holding to the parity of the ministry. This is a cardinal principle of the Reformed polity. The ordained ministry is not more clearly distinguished from the laity than it is homogeneous and of equal rank. And yet, on the one hand, with a marked decline in the number of forthcoming ministers and a dearth upon the churches already not much short of disastrous, and, on the other hand, with the wide dissemination of Biblical training and learning, and with the development in our churches of unordained men who indisputably possess both the graces of speech and the grace of God, it becomes a practical question how far the churches should go in giving official sanction to the public utterances of unordained preachers of the gospel. The Presbyterian Church of the United States of America has a constitutional provision for local evangelists, licensed by the Presbytery for one year subject to renewal, and if renewed for four consecutive years, the experience thus gained may be taken as that of a novitiate for the ministry and, after a satisfactory examination upon the equivalent of a three years' study of theology and kindred subjects, the novitiate may be ordained to the full gospel ministry. The Presbyterian Church of Canada has made a still further concession to the exigencies of frontier work, and by special act of its

Assembly it grants qualified and limited ordination to certain men who are not eligible for a pastorate and who can work only under Presbyterial oversight, associated with the control of the Home Missions Committee.

Your committee refrain from making any recommendations, but we believe that there is a great potential force, resident in our laity, which might well be employed in carrying the gospel to the unchurched. However, we believe, too, that the ordained ministry should always control and direct these efforts. A great interdenominational laymen's evangelistic council has recently been organized in Chicago and we note with gratification that while the laity does much of the work, the ministers are in a position to lead and advise and control. The recent organization of the Presbyterian Brotherhood in the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America contemplates the development of this latent force and has already been applied in some splendid evangelistic activities. We are disposed to believe that the Reformed churches of this country could greatly advance their evangelistic work if they would organize a summer school of theology, under joint auspices and at some suitable place, for the quickening of our pastors in evangelistic spirit and for the study, both by ministers and intelligent laymen, of the great truths of the gospel and of the best methods of Christian work. It is significant that at the last meeting of the General Synod of the Reformed (Dutch) Church of America the faculty of the Synod's Theological Seminary at New Brunswick was authorized to arrange as far as practicable for a special course for lay workers, in preparing for the service of the churches at home and in its missionary field. The people are bound to get ideas concerning Christianity, and it is certainly worth while to see to it that *our* people get true ideas and at the same time cherish a genuine loyalty to what we hold to be Christianity's true meaning and work. Is it not possible for the allied churches of the Western Section to correlate and coördinate their forces in this great common work? It is much to be desired that they should

protect each other against the vagrancies and vagaries of incompetent and unworthy revivalists; that they should combine their forces for aggressive work in certain great centers of our population and that they should foster and further any plans, practicable and approved, which would add to the carrying power of the preacher's voice and the saving power of the church's work.

3. We must never forget that in Christian lands, at least, the key to the work of evangelization is, under God, committed to the hands of the local church and of the settled pastor. We may plan great spectacular campaigns and carry forward magnificent concerted movements, but the tide will never rise and remain higher than the zeal and faith of the church itself. Pastoral evangelism is the aim to be kept in view in all agitation and education upon this subject. There are reasons for the hesitating attitude which many of our congregations assume toward occasional spasms of evangelism. Paripatetic irresponsibles have too often brought into disrepute the high office which was sanctioned in New Testament history and has been greatly blessed in many lands and ages since. We believe that every evangelist should have a definite ecclesiastical status and that his loyalty to the faith and order and authority of his church should never be far to seek. But the hope of the future is in a generation of pastors, filled with evangelistic zeal and backed up by churches who will count many other things but loss if they can only bring men through their efforts into the knowledge and service of Jesus Christ. This requires no *outre* methods, no sensational tricks, no unusual or unwarranted resort to ethics or esthetics or anesthetics; the world is more often than we think rather repelled than attracted by efforts to win it which it knows only too well are a compromise of the church's dignity, a lowering of her sacred standards, and a reproachful proof of her lack of faith in the self-evidencing power of the truth of the gospel, and of the saving power of the Grace of God. But within proper bounds and as far as

is consistent with solemn appeals and kindly approaches to men we believe that the church should avail itself of every consecrated ingenuity and sagacious enterprise in its unremitting efforts either to bring the people to the gospel, or, where this cannot be done, to take the gospel to the people.

4. We profoundly believe that no greater interest confronts the church to-day than that of evangelism. We call it foreign missions or home missions elsewhere, but when it is in our own parish or our own precinct, we call it evangelism. "This ought we to have done and not to leave the other undone." Many a pastor has a heavy heart to-day because he feels his work limited in scope and hampered in results. He longs for the freedom of apostolic conditions. He is vaguely conscious of something wrong, partly in himself and partly in the conditions, and he is not clear as to the proper and effectual remedy. But his heart sinks within him as he sees the few that hear his message and the many that heed it not. It is small comfort to reflect that the fault is theirs, not ours. It is our business, like our Lord's, not only to save, but also to seek the lost. We submit that the churches of this Section have no graver question to consider than this. If we fail here, we fail disastrously. The world laughs; the hesitating turn away; the young men in our colleges will none of it, and the church wonders why candidates for the ministry are so few; and more and more the church itself, drunk with the wine of worldliness and complacent in the memory of greater days of grace and victory in the past, gravitates down lower and yet lower in the scale of lifeless intellectualism, institutional prestige and conventional respectability.

But on the other hand, if we succeed here, we succeed gloriously. The church that saves men from sin to God, the church that goes out widely and wisely, with gracious touch and tender dignity, that gets near to all classes of the masses with the sympathetic sacrificing spirit of her blessed Lord, the church that, while withstanding assaults without and perils within in the midst of all her manifold plans and agencies,

holds true to the one original germinal impulse of the salvation of the lost; that church will find a thousand vexing problems already solved in this and, relying upon neither might nor power but upon the Spirit of the Living God, it may be well assured of this that whatever else it may have or may not have, whatever else it may do or may not do, it is doing the one work that most urgently needs to be done, the one work that lies nearest the heart of Him who cherishes the church as His beloved bride and has "purchased her with His own blood."

TRENTON, N. J.

IV.

THE PREACHER'S GREATEST PROBLEM.

BY THE REV. SCOTT R. WAGNER.

The preacher has numerous and various problems to solve. Many problems vary in different ages and different countries. Some problems of the city preacher are different from some problems of the country preacher. Everywhere the minister has the problem of his own self improvement, the continual building of his body, mind, and soul. Every minister has some sort of question in determining his theology and philosophy, but this varies according to the man's tastes and training. All have something to do with the matter of church polity, with forms of worship, government, and discipline. The problem of his own salvation must not be lost sight of. And in these times many ministers would be inclined to put above all other problems the problem of how to live and keep a Christian disposition, while quarreling with the issue of making a dollar do the work of two dollars.

The problem which underlies all problems is not new, but its solution depends upon our understanding of certain conditions. John Fiske, in his book "Through Nature to God," derives three postulates which form fundamental ground. He says all men, everywhere, have a consciousness of Deity; they have also a sense of the soul as undying; and again all mankind believes in the unseen world having an ethical significance for man on this side of the great divide.

The working out of these and adjacent questions, forms, to a large extent, the history of religion. To-day we state our question as follows: (1) Every human soul, in its deepest operations, is not only conscious of, and in need of, but is also craving for fellowship with the Divine Father. (2)

The Divine Father is always ready and willing to come into intimate fellowship with the human soul. (3) The greatest problem of the minister is to establish and foster an intimate, harmonious, and satisfying relation between the human soul and the Divine Father. The normal relation between the soul of man and the Spirit of God is harmony, just as harmony is the normal relation between a man and his wife, or between a father and his child. But all sorts of conditions tend to produce a relation that has varying degrees of inharmonious fellowship. Questions of education, wealth, poverty, sin, misfortune, misinformation, pleasure, and such like, are the conditions.

The most important part of our proposition to-day is to determine the proper attitude of the souls of the race toward the Divine Father, to determine whether or not the souls of men are craving for fellowship with The Eternal. Also to give some attention, more or less indirectly, to the relation of the Father God, as interpreted by Jesus, to the souls of men; and to conclude with reference to the solution of the issue raised. What, then, is the status of the souls of mankind, as they are called up for reflection and study, in the light of the question now before us? The Psalmist, in trying to voice the condition of his age in spiritual matters, said: "This is the generation of them that seek him"; and in trying to make the same conditions appear in a personal form, said: "My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God." In reading over these words we feel that for ourselves these thoughts are often the real expression of our own souls, but when we survey that part of the world with which we are personally familiar and with which we come in frequent contact, what is our answer to the question, Is this a generation of them that seek God? Are there many people who are thirsty for the living God? I answer both these questions in the affirmative. In undertaking to set forth my convictions that this is a God-seeking age, I realize that I have upon me, apparently, the burden of proof. The present age is so often called a godless age, an age of

unrighteousness, a worldly, licentious, materialistic, money-crazed age, an age of doubt, or of socialism, that to say anything to the contrary must seem, to some, like calling good evil and evil good. From all parts of the country come wails on the depletion of our churches and the neglect of church attendance. Church attendance is not what it should be and I agree that it is not what it might be. That the world is growing worse is the opinion of not a few. That the age, for some reason, is so far adrift from the church that every denomination is short in its supply of candidates for the ministry is not a theory but a painful fact. That many young men thinking of the ministry as a profession are diverted therefrom by parents or friends, is common knowledge. That crime is not abating in quantity, that sin is by no means nearing extinction, that doubt and agnosticism are finding new converts every day, that the old time reverence for the Bible is no more to be found, that implicit adherence to our ecclesiastical functions is waning, are all evident and almost beyond dispute. Nevertheless, in the face of all these and many other tendencies, I do not think that we miss the spirit of the times when we contend that people are very hungry for God; that souls faint for God, for the living God.

Looking at the surface of a smoothly flowing stream, especially during a storm, we cannot easily tell which way the water is flowing. Looking at the superficial waves of the ocean of thought we cannot accurately know their direction nor fathom their real depth. *Let us try to interpret the under current.* Why men do not go to church is a theme much more frequently discussed than the theme, why men do go to church. We distinguish between seeking the church and seeking God. Our proposition, as stated above, was not that the present age is a church-going age, but that it is a God-hungry age; and we must bear in mind that not going to church is not always the same as not having any desire to know God. Not being a church member and not being a church-goer may be a sign of being ungodly and unrighteous, but it

is not proof thereof. I believe with all my heart that people cannot do anything better than belong to and attend a church. I believe it is a sign of a hunger and a thirst for God. I believe it is best for the individual and for the community. But when I consider what church-going is; and when I consider how much imperfection there is in both pulpit and pew; when I reflect upon how often the precept and practice of both pulpit and pew are very far apart; when I consider how weak and futile my own efforts seem in trying to present God to a lot of people I see before me; when I consider how unworthy I am to stand between God and man, in some small sense a mediator; and when I consider that all of us are nothing more than men, painfully limited by all that is human; when I consider such thoughts I am absolutely persuaded that we underestimate the number of people whose souls are crying out for the living God.

A few years ago a pastor was preaching a series of sermons on the old question, "Why men do not go to church," and was using considerable space in the daily papers to advertise and report. On the Monday after the delivery of the principal sermon on the general theme it was my duty to call at the office of a prominent non-churchman. The first thing he said to me was: "I have just been reading what this preacher has to say about why men do not go to church." I at once asked him if the reasons given, as reported, were the same as he, a non-church member, would give. The reasons of the preacher and this man did not agree in all points, though they did in some, and after much reflection, I feel that some things the non-churchman said were as near the real cause of certain conditions as were the reasons the preacher gave. Our conversation on the subject was quite lengthy, and we drifted into different phases of the church and God question. While many persons will not admit that a man who never goes to church can have a serious thought about God and the human soul, nevertheless I am convinced, from this and repeated conversations with this same man, and others of a similar type, that in a great

many unsuspected places and in a great many unsuspected persons, there are minds that think seriously and hearts that hunger truthfully for the living God.

After the incident of the interview with the man just referred to, I made it my business to conduct a quiet, but earnest inquiry, into the nature of the thoughts and feelings of the minds and hearts of many people who were to all appearances worldly and ungodly, with the particular aim of finding out if there was any latent desire for God, and what was the reason they did not belong to or attend a church. I shall be unable to go into details in this paper, but will give you only a general idea of the results. I first went to some men, whom I knew quite well, who were active club members. I asked them questions like these: When your fellow club members speak about the church, what is their attitude? When they speak about the preacher, when they speak about God, what is the nature of their speech? Do they often discuss what we might define as sacred things? Among the most profane and intemperate persons with whom you associate or come into contact, do you ever find that they show an attitude of what might be called a hunger for God, and for what his name, when used reverently, signifies?

I carried this same sort of inquiry through big mills and factories, getting evidence from the rank and file of the persons at work. From labor unions and socialist bodies I also collected evidence along the same lines. From every available source I tried to get the root feelings in the hearts of the people whom the church is likely to speak of as "being at enmity with God." I learned this from my investigations: that while men are often profane and women often vulgar; while people often ridicule the church and make ridiculous jibes at the preacher; while many show great indifference to what we call "spiritual matters"; yet underneath all the profanity, real and apparent, and underneath all the apparent disregard for the religion and the church, there is a sense of God and a hunger for God that is not merely superficial. That the

people of whom we are now speaking were doing right in their way of thinking, I do not contend. That I did not wholly excuse in them the things to which I have been referring, goes without saying. That they often thought seriously about God, talked quietly of him, when with their equals and associates even spoke of a desire for more of his life, that they confessed to secretly praying to him, as best they knew how, revealed what I feel perfectly justified in calling a true thirst for God. They were mistaken and misinformed, biased in their views by many things, led astray in thought and habit, victims of many sins, making up that class we call the worldly and profane, yet not without God, not infidels, but rather with parched tongues trying to slake their thirst at the wrong fountain and by wrong methods. For these and many other reasons I stated at the opening of this paper that the human soul was not only conscious of and in need of, but also craved, fellowship with the Divine Father.

Now, I never approach any man but that I have the feeling that if I may properly get into his confidence I am going to find good soil for some of the divine seed. In the days of Jesus on the earth there was a class of people called publicans and sinners and harlots, who, when they saw God as he was in Christ Jesus, almost leaped upon him for joy, in finding that for which their souls hungered and thirsted; and the same hunger is still working in the hearts of many upon whom we are more likely to look as being at enmity with God than as being famished for him.

There are other reasons for believing in the statement that the hearts of men are hungry for the life of God, some of which are here referred to. Take the literature of to-day and analyze it; and how many people are eager to read on subjects that have a religious bearing! In the realm of science and philosophy, where the intellectual alone can travel with ease, the greatest effort has been to find truth, to know the first principle, to know the great power that works for righteousness; in short, to find and know, not only the origin of life or the

origin of species, but to find the eternal power we call God and harmonize the hunger of the soul with that power. The demand for light on sacred things was never so great as it is to-day. The religious presses are kept running almost day and night. No sooner is a good book produced than the edition is exhausted, and so on with a second and a third. Notwithstanding the fact that Bibles are very numerous, yet the sale goes on by hundreds and by thousands. More persons are devoting themselves, with time and money, to the serious study of the Word, and more persons are discussing the Bible and religious literature and more persons are anxious about a great many things pertaining to their faith and soul development, than in any previous age, or than we are ready to believe of this age until we have made some thorough investigation. It is not many years since all discussion of theology was in the hands of the schools, but now the same questions are being worked out by the masses, and by them because they are interested, because they are anxious about some things, and are conscious of certain definite needs for the soul. The result of all their heterogeneous reading and discussion is great confusion of doctrine and of essential faith, but underneath all of it is the human heart and the human heart unsatisfied. This is the same as saying that the human heart is hungry. It has aches and wants that it may often misinterpret; it has cravings which it can neither analyze nor express; feelings that find no better language than a child a year old can find to express itself, and yet with wants, desires, and hungerings none the less real.

When we come to analyze the condition and conduct of many who have never taken any interest in the church, we find, according to their own confessions and testimonies, that what a great many men on their way to worldly indulgence and intemperance want, or wanted when first they became sensual devotees, is not the actual indulgence in intemperate practices, but the effect of them. They are uneasy, discontented, have troubles, both real and imaginary, have no rest or peace of

mind, body or heart, and what they want is a sort of an oblivion, which they think gives them that calm for which there is the intense craving. It is not that they seek to be turned from men into beasts; it is not that they prefer the cold, damp bed of the gutter to the one at home; it is not that they seek poverty and to be castaways, but it is because they have some sense of a great need, an unsatisfied craving, which for the time being seems to find satisfaction in complete intoxication or other absorbing indulgence. What they really need and what they really want, though they may not know it and may resent if you suggest it to them, is peace, content, comfort, and freedom from what now seems like serpents' fangs of torment. Experience shows that when these men are properly brought to the fountain of life and have their hunger and thirst quenched in that life-giving stream, they find what they have long desired and hungered for, and knew it not, was nothing else than God, the living God.

Again, the very fact that numberless people will cling to any new form of faith, rather any new fads or theories, as Christian Science, or Dowieism, or Spiritualism and the like, is not an argument against our proposition, but in favor of it. It is a sign of a hunger not satisfied when people are ready to run to every new method that is reported to have found a better and shorter way into the Holy Place. They go hither and thither with an uncertain knowledge of an inward craving, which seeks the face of God. In the Gospels there is an account of a man who had been possessed of many devils and the devils were cast out; he was likened to a man who went away and walked through dry places, seeking rest and finding none; of course, he found it not; he was hungry, but he took the wrong method of satisfying his hunger. No one finds mental peace in going contrary to the natural laws of the mind. No one finds bodily health in going contrary to the laws that control the body. And no one finds soul peace, or soul health in going contrary to the laws which prevail in its

realm. This man's thirst was led in the wrong direction, and so, as the record says, he came back to his former house and taketh to himself seven other spirits and the last state was worse than the first. He is typical of so many persons who come to the churches a few times, or for a season, and then drop away. It may be that they came to the church seeking rest and finding none they went back to their former habits of sin and indulged in them with a new zeal, but their heart hunger for God was not satisfied, and as long as they live, that spark of celestial fire, of which the poet speaks, will sometimes glow, and if properly approached can usually be fanned into a flame.

That the church does not always meet the needs of men, and does not always succeed in mediating that peace which the world needs, is not always the fault of the church. Yet the greatest question before the church to-day is how to properly feed the bread of life that it may satisfy the hungry world; how to administer God that the souls of men may find peace. The multitudes to-day are like they were in the days of Jesus; they are a great way from home and have no bread. The multitudes being hungry, it is the business of the preacher and the church to feed them and not allow them to go away hungry. The disciples in the days of Jesus said send them away to the villages and let them buy, but Christ said give ye them to eat. I believe, too often, in our age and in previous ages, the church has been willing to allow the hungry multitude to go away and seek its own way of satisfying its deeper heart hungers. Too often, living souls, hungry for a living God, have come and asked for the bread of life and the church has thrown at them the crusts of old musty theology and church polity. Too often men cry out for the water of life and they are handed a sop, dipped in the vinegar and gall of denominational controversy or history or pride. Too often do eager minds ask for a little guidance and direction and light, on dark subjects, and they are told to swallow wholesale an unreasonable creed or theology or they will be damned. Alas, too often

have those hungry for a personal uplift sought to find help in getting the influence of one supposed to have risen to sterling character through the church, only to find that the lives of that man and many others are not true to their professions. Surely, the world is not to be too harshly condemned for having lost much reverence and respect for things ecclesiastical. So many have come thirsty and gone away more thirsty, and the greatest problem of the day comes to be for the preacher a very serious problem.

How shall the church and the minister meet the needs of the present day? How shall they satisfy the hungry and the thirsty? How can they help men to find what they need? The answers to these questions lead us to the heart of the minister's greatest problem. The greatest question of the age is not socialism or social ethics. It is not the change of a creed or a catechism. It is not evolution or higher criticism. It is not the new theology as over against the old theology. The burning question is the old problem of Jesus, to give the Father to the children, and to give the children to their Father; to bring the prodigal back to the open arms of the ever-loving Father and to keep the elder brother in proper harmony and spiritual growth at home. To this end the first responsibility is placed rightly upon the preacher, though the preacher must not be asked to carry all the responsibility.

The people sometimes say, "Let the pulpit give us great living sermons and we will all, and always, attend church." In this respect the preachers are more honest than able, they cannot always be delivering masterpieces. In order to meet the demand and satisfy the needs and bring about the solution of the question before us, all sorts of superficial plans are propagated. Some ministers say that we must make the church more spectacular. On all sides we hear that what the age needs is a social church, this social element running out into all kinds of suppers and bazaars and lectures and entertainments, lantern slides, and anything that will attract, like the bill-boards for the theater and the barker for the street per-

formance. Some say the sermons must be on the same live topics that fill the daily papers and magazines. Others, again, say the new theology, and again others the old theology, as though if that were changed the heavens would fall. I firmly believe that these and similar methods are just the things the preacher must not use and the church should not support. These things will not satisfy the thirst for God. What this thirsty, God-hungry age wants and needs is not the things of the social and political and material world hashed over in the pulpit, not the affairs and fancies of men worked over and offered as that which will feed the deepest hungerings of human nature, but they want God. God is what and whom they need. God is what they really seek, and giving them God in all his fullness, in all his love, in all his satisfying goodness, is the only thing that will bring entire and permanent peace and content.

The hunger of the world is great. The need of the times to meet this hunger is also great and the problem of the preacher was never so great as now. If the world, the soul-hungry world, says, "Give us God to quench our parched hearts," and the preacher gives them theories about God, it will not do. If sinners are hungry for the companionship of Christ and the preacher holds up before them the theories of the church on the doctrines of the Logos, the atonement, the immaculate conception, etc., as expressed in creeds or other formularies, it will not do. It will be like giving a stone when they ask for bread. If they say, "Lead us into the spirit of his presence," and there is proclaimed simply a doctrine of a third person, it does not and will not satisfy.

When we look into the faces of men and women, what a crying need we see! When the preacher looks out on this hungry sea of soul-needly people, well may he wonder how he is going to scatter even a few crumbs for them. But just three things must be kept in mind: (1) That this God for whom men hunger, and whom men need, is always a Father; (2) that this soul, that is without that for which it hungers, is always

a child of that Father; (3) that the normal, and therefore desirable relation, is one of harmony and union. When a little child gets lost from its parents and is restored tired and sobbing to the family for the loss of which it was in great distress, there is no need for a lecture on how to avoid getting lost when in a crowd, but put the little hand in that of the parent and the sobbing is over for the child and the anxiety for the parent; both understand. When a husband and wife become estranged and after while hunger for the peace which is so much better than discord, there is no need of anything more than the old embrace, and they are both happy and both understand. The great business of the preacher to-day is to take the hand of the erring child and lay it in the hand of God and say, "This is your Father."

But how is this to be done? Some suggestions: The souls of many are pauperized with selfishness and greed, but God is love. The church and minister must say, here, "God is love; be filled with love and you will be enriched, and revived." The mother worn out with fretful children and broken in heart over the infidelity of her husband, and also smarting under the consciousness of her own errors, must be led, not to the church to learn the catechism and creed and the peculiar theology of the denomination, but she must be led to the arms of God's love and there left to rest her weary head on the Father's breast. The sinner stained by impurity, or lost in the whirl of sensual pleasure, needs not instructions in the miracles, or the infallibility of the Bible, or the nature of the Trinity, but just to touch the hem of his garment and be made whole and clean. What does the world suffer from? It suffers in the broadest sense from sin, and God is the antidote for the poisonous effects of sin. The soul of man is weary with the struggle of life—God is a refuge and a rest. The labor of the world is for bread and clothes and possessions and pleasures, but when the world acquires them it is still unsatisfied—God says, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." God is a father, God is love, God

is peace of mind and soul, God is truth, God is honesty, God is kindness and tender mercy, God is hope, and God is life. The soul of man needs and cries out for its Father. The heart craves for love, pure and true. It craves for the peace which is eternal. It asks for truth and the way thereto. The souls of men and women are famishing for true sympathy and kindness. The care-worn, discouraged heart wants, needs, cries out aloud and in secret for hope, for life, and not death; and for all these God eternally stands.

What the world really wants and what the minister must really give is such service that this crying thirst of the human soul may find its satisfaction in the living God—and to realize this end constitutes the minister's greatest problem.

RIEGELSVILLE, PA.

V.

THE GREATNESS OF *HAMLET* AS A WORK OF
DRAMATIC ART.¹

BY PROFESSOR C. ERNEST WAGNER, A.M.

The play of *Hamlet* is, all things considered, Shakspere's greatest single work. Other plays, to be sure, excel in certain particulars. In delicacy of fancy and sheer poetic beauty, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* easily outranks it. In spirited characterization and the happy blending of comedy with history, the two parts of *King Henry IV* surpass it. In skill of construction and the subtle interweaving of varied elements to produce a harmonious whole, *The Merchant of Venice* exceeds it. In animated action, in brilliant dialogue and the sparkle of witty repartee, both *As You Like It* and *Much Ado About Nothing* outshine it. In the province of tragedy *Macbeth* and *King Lear* are more intense, more dramatically effective. Nevertheless, after all deductions, exceptions, and qualifications have been made, the play of *Hamlet* remains, in a class by itself, Shakspere's masterpiece—the greatest work of the greatest dramatic genius the world has produced.

When we come to consider the reasons for this preëminence, when we ask the question, "Why has this drama intrenched itself so strongly in the popular heart, retaining even to-day, full three hundred years after it was first produced, its place upon the boards by the side of the most successful modern plays?" an interesting problem is opened up.

The proverbial expression, "Like the play of *Hamlet* with Hamlet left out," is sufficiently indicative of the popular feel-

¹ A paper read at a meeting of The Avon Literary Club, of Mercersburg, Pa., held on the evening of December 11, 1908.

ing. To the theatre-going public and to the general reader of this and other days, the character of Hamlet is alone important. In him the interest centres. With his exits and his entrances the real action ceases or begins. All other characters are unimportant, indeed almost negligible.

This fascination of Hamlet, this domination of the scene by him, is not hard to explain. For in his hero, if hero he may be termed, Shakspere has drawn a figure of irresistible interest and charm. The prince is well-born, young, handsome, intelligent, refined, romantic. Besides all this, he is a lover. He has been abused and wronged. Saddened and disillusioned as he is by the consciousness of infidelity, of treachery, and of foul murder done upon a father whom he loved, and overwhelmed by the task so solemnly put upon him of avenging the hideous crime, he is indeed a figure to enlist at the very outset the warmest sympathy, the devoted loyalty, of beholders and readers alike.

As the action advances and the mesh of destiny is irresistibly woven about him, these feelings are intensified; and when the final and inevitable *denouement* arrives, the heart is stirred to its depths by the tragic havoc that befalls this Hamlet and all who have crossed his path. The appeal, then, of the play to men in every age and generation is essentially the appeal of Hamlet, the ill-starred Dane.

To the serious student, however, Hamlet is by no means the sole source of interest, the single element of strength, in the play. From whatever point of view he contemplates the work, he is overawed by its greatness. Each succeeding study only serves to increase his wonder.

If the subject of consideration be the plot, he will be amazed to find out of what crude and simple materials the master dramatist has erected the mighty framework which succeeding generations have chosen to call the supreme example of his dramatic art. The story, as we know, is very old. It is found first in literary form in the chronicle of *Saxo Grammaticus*, a Danish historian, who wrote in the closing years of the twelfth

century. It is likely that there was an earlier play on the London stage which treated the Hamlet theme; but every vestige of it has been lost, and it can have been at best a crude and clumsy piece of work. In this material, perchance unpromising enough to the tyro, Shakspere, the trained craftsman, now in the mature period of his career (about 1602), discovered the elements of a soul-moving tragedy.

It is significant that from 1601 to 1608, the period when his powers were the ripest and his productive energy most active, Shakspere chose dark and tragic themes. It is during these years that the solemn figures of Brutus, Othello, Lear, and Macbeth people his fancy; that he wrestles with the darkest problems of human destiny; that he portrays with inexorable fidelity the evil that is in men's hearts and the suffering that is in the world through sin. Out of the depths of his profoundest feelings, out of the fulness of his own experience, the dramatist speaks to us in these the mightiest works of his genius.

And tragedy, after all, say what we will, comes nearer to us than comedy ever can. It moves us to the very centre of our being. It reveals to us, with relentless austerity, the inmost secrets of man's nature, its greatness and its littleness, its august virtues, its Titanic vices. It exhibits with unabashed candor the workings of the "essential passions" and the "elemental feelings." Rightly, therefore, the ancient Greeks placed tragedy above comedy, crowning with victor's wreath the successful tragic poet. And rightly are the greenest bays in Shakspere's chaplet of fame the mighty tragedies of *Othello*, *Lear*, *Macbeth*, and *Hamlet*.

In *Hamlet* most of all (and here is one of its strongest fascinations for the attentive student), we seem to come close to Shakspere himself, to be taken for the nonce into his confidence, to catch a momentary glimpse of that elusive personality, concerning which we would fain know so much. We like, at least, to believe that Shakspere put more of himself, as he was about the year 1602, into the character of Hamlet than he put into any other single dramatic creation. Surely, the

world-weariness of Hamlet, as evinced in his marvelous soliloquies, was Shakspere's own when he conceived the part, during those years of gloom that followed the death of his father, mother, brother, younger daughter, and only son, Hamnet, the execution of Essex, the disgrace and imprisonment of Southampton, and the alienation of the mysterious friend of the sonnets. Surely it is Shakspere himself who protests against the demoralization of the drama because of the "late innovation"; who deplores the vogue of the children players, the "little eyases that cry out on the top of question, and are most tyrannically clapped for 't"; who defines in immortal terms the true function of the drama, "to hold, as 't were, the mirror up to nature; to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure;" and who, out of the bitterness of his own experience, inveighs against the player who "tears a noble passion to tatters," and the clown who, not content with the lines set down for him by the poet, must needs divert the "groundlings" with local gags and extempore horse play. Surely, then, in Hamlet's brilliant soliloquies we have the scintillations of Shakspere's dazzling wit. In Hamlet's mental attitude, in his intellectual processes, Shakspere has revealed to us, perhaps unintentionally and in spite of himself, the play of his own god-like reason upon matters that concerned him most nearly.

These are but a few of the more obvious elements of interest in a play that, of itself, may fitly serve as the study of a lifetime. So vast is its scope, so exquisite its structure, so far-reaching the import of many of its lines, so complex its delineation and interplay of character, so comprehensive its knowledge of human life, so wide and undying its appeal! In our consideration of the subject we must perforce be limited to a very cursory glance at a few of the more salient features of this stupendous work.

Let us notice, first of all, the dramatic and personal values of the so-called "minor" characters. For the reason noted before,

they do not as a rule receive the attention they deserve. And yet, in the delineation of these varied and interesting types, Shakspere has shown marvelous skill. Were they not dwarfed by the commanding personality of Hamlet, they would be more fully appreciated.

Take, for example, Claudius, the usurping king. We are prejudiced against him from the start because we look at him through Hamlet's eyes. And yet, when we come to estimate him at his true dramatic or even human worth, we find that he is far from being a mere "Vice of kings," a "king of shreds and patches." Whenever he is presented to us in the evolution of the play, whenever he speaks or acts for himself or in his rôle of king, we find him to be the strong, masterful, courageous, tactful man, fit to rule and equal to every emergency. He is a wise statesman, a tender husband, a finished courtier and diplomat. Whether the problem be Hamlet's strange "transformation," Polonius' violent death, Laertes' insurrection, Ophelia's sad derangement, or the threatened incursion of "young Norway," he is, so far as we can see, "every inch a king," and far more fit for Denmark's throne than Hamlet could ever hope to be. True, he goes down in the general ruin at the end of the play, but only as a victim of Nemesis.

Again, if we permit ourselves to look at Gertrude through Hamlet's eyes, we shall have a distorted picture of her. "Frailty, thy name is woman!" is perhaps the worst that may be said of her. To assume with Hamlet that she was accessory to, or even cognizant of, the foul deed whereby her first husband was removed, is unjust, unwarranted by the facts in evidence. Indeed, the first quarto makes it entirely clear that she was innocent of the murder. Even in the folio text, the present acting version, the horror with which she hears the charge from her own son's lips is natural, not assumed. That she was possessed of sufficient personal charm to win and hold the affection of Claudius, there can be no doubt. Her solicitude for her distracted son, her eagerness to put the best construction upon his wild deeds, and to protect him, if possible,

from their natural consequences, show her to be a woman, not a monster, endowed with true motherly feeling. Beyond this, in extenuation, we may not go. It is hard to think of her as having given birth to Hamlet. He seems not, in mental or spiritual traits, to be his mother's son; unless, inconstancy or fickleness of purpose be a part of the maternal legacy. Neither is he, for that matter, the son of his father—a statesman, a warrior, and a man of action; unless it be in seriousness, in dignity, and mental acumen.

Horatio, the friend of Hamlet, is an interesting personality. He is a student, a scholar, a serious-minded, temperate, self-centred man. Hamlet admires him for these qualities, and in a touching interview speaks to him words of unwonted warmth. He takes him into his confidence, trusts him with his secret, and when he comes to die pleads with him to clear his name and deliver it unstained to posterity. In intellectual pursuits the two have evidently much in common. We feel, however, that Horatio is not tainted with Hamlet's overfondness for speculation, that he is not willing to follow in those flights "beyond the reaches of our souls" which have an irresistible fascination for the vision-seeing prince.

Polonius, the father of Laertes and Ophelia, is admirably drawn. In him, though without his knowledge or consent, the element of comedy supervenes; and while he struts his little hour upon the stage, we are forced by turns to sneer, to smile, and perchance to pity. As a type of the worn-out courtier, smug and consequential, pattering words of wisdom, the full import of which he himself seems not always to understand, Polonius is drawn to the life. His Chesterfieldian precepts to Laertes on the eve of his departure for Paris, his fatherly advice to Ophelia with regard to young Hamlet's "tenders" of affection, reveal most fully the fibre of his moral nature and the standards that go therewith. His diagnosis of Hamlet's malady is exquisite, and his recital of the several stages through which his patient declined before arriving at complete madness, is a delicious bit of unconscious humor. That Hamlet

should hold him in contempt is natural. His shallowness and self-complacency he despises. His meddlesomeness he resents. His underhand and sneaking practices he loathes. On every possible occasion he quizzes him and holds him up to ridicule; and when finally, after the fatal pass through the arras, he discovers that the eavesdropper is this same prying, sneaking Polonius, he serenely washes his hands of the crime and sets his conscience entirely at rest—a characteristic, significant incident.

Given a father like Polonius, and we should expect a son like Laertes and a daughter like Ophelia. Laertes is a type of the "young blood" of the later Elizabethan time and the early days of James I. He is a frank Hedonist, wholly abandoned to the pursuit of pleasure. Like Horatio, he has come home to attend the coronation of the king; but it is not from Wittenberg that he has come. He is no student. He makes no pretence of being one. Life at the Danish court he finds very irksome. Having paid his formal respects, he is eager to be off again. But before he embarks he must needs give his sister some brotherly advice. Tainted and debased himself, he is totally unable to appreciate a nature like Hamlet's, and therefore misconstrues his motives and breathes innuendoes against his character. Ophelia shrewdly discounts his moral precepts, emanating as they do from one who "himself the primrose path of dalliance treads, and reck not his own rede." Nevertheless, his suggestive words, reinforced as they are by Polonius' sneers and commands, sink into her mind and poison it, as base insinuations seem so commonly to do. In the later scenes of the play Laertes is used as an effective foil to Hamlet. In him we are shown the spirited man of action, disinclined to reflect, eager only to do, yielding without hesitation or scruple to the elemental instinct that clamors for revenge.

In Ophelia the influences of heredity and environment are subtly portrayed. She was, we must believe, an attractive and withal an amiable girl. That Hamlet once loved her there can

be no doubt. The tokens he had given her, his spoken and written protestations of affection, and that final surge of passion as he stood by her open grave, all prove this. So far as we are permitted to know Ophelia, she is devoid of any glaring fault. She has in her favor good looks, a sweet temper, and an intellect of no mean calibre. Gertrude, the queen, regarded her with favor, and would gladly have had her for a daughter-in-law. That she was capable in a sense of appreciating Hamlet's worth, is proved by her eloquent eulogium when she beholds the change in him. Her quiet dignity when assailed by his cruel words is admirable, and the very fact that her reason is unhinged by the calamities that befall her father and quondam lover, proves beyond question the strength of her feelings and the genuineness of her womanly instincts. Why is it, then, that Hamlet is estranged, and for his love offers her rude taunts and unfeeling jests? There is a deeper reason for this than his madness, be that real or assumed. Ophelia is, after all, a commonplace, conventional girl, brought up in the atmosphere of the court and dependent for her moral standards and her views of life upon such men as her father and her brother, or, if you like, upon such women as Gertrude. She is thoroughly conventional, and therefore timid and complaisant. Hamlet is the reverse of all this; and therefore when the test comes, when the issue arises between father, brother, and the court, on the one side, and himself on the other, and when Ophelia, too weak to meet the ordeal, fails him, he promptly estimates her at her true worth, and sadly but irrevocably turns away. To me, one of the finest situations in the play is that scene where Hamlet applies the final test. Words are not necessary. He need only gaze unspeaking into her eyes and, seeing mirrored there the cowering, dismayed soul of the woman who could not understand, who would not, if she could, bear with him the burden that had been laid upon him, he departs as he had come, silent but resolved. Hamlet needed for his mate a girl of Juliet's mettle, or, if you will, a

woman like Clara Middleton, a woman stronger than himself, who, by giving herself, might perchance have saved him.

Fortinbras, of Norway, is an engaging figure. Here is a man of heroic mold—strong, capable, courageous, fit to rule and eager for the task. A plain, practical man of affairs, too, unhampered by scruples, undismayed by difficulties, a type that Shakspere loved to portray. He comes upon the scene at the end of the play, like a creature from another world. Nemesis has done her work upon the sinned against and sinning. With the dying Hamlet we give him our voice for the succession and gladly surrender the reins of government to his strong and unpolluted hands. Fortinbras is another telling foil to Hamlet. We see in him what Hamlet should have been would he have succeeded worthily to his father's place upon the throne of Denmark.

Rosencrantz and Guildenstern have been termed the nonentities of the play. Shift the names and they fit the men as well. And yet they serve their purpose. They draw from Hamlet some interesting observations, and without a twinge of conscience he sends them to their final, and, in his opinion, just reward. Even Osrice, the court butterfly, is a type immortalized for us by the dramatist's touch. Only a passing touch, it is true, and yet a touch so deft, so sure, so unerring in its fixing qualities, that men and women with an eye for the ridiculous shall continue through the ages to see the discomfited courtier, after his interview with Hamlet and Horatio, "run away like a lapwing with his shell on his head."

The grave-digging clowns, who furnish, at the opening of the fifth act, the comic relief which Shakspere seemed to feel so necessary even in his most sombre tragedies, are evidently drawn from the life. They are types of the heavy, ale-sodden rustic, such as the dramatist must frequently have observed in his own native Warwickshire. He never tired of studying the "humours" and exhibiting the mental processes of this class of men.

Having glanced at the several minor characters of the play,

let us turn now to the study of the central figure, whose personality and whose fortunes dominate the action and determine the inevitable *denouement*.

Hamlet, Prince of Denmark, is withal the most solemn and impressive figure in the entire gallery of the master dramatist. From the moment that he comes upon the scene, clad in the habiliments of woe and enshrouded in an atmosphere of mystery, he seizes upon the imagination and enchains the attention of beholder and reader alike. The fascination increases as the play goes on, and he is made by the dramatist's art to reveal himself through the rapidly shifting scenes. To his associates he remains to the very end an enigma; but to us who are permitted to hear his wonderful soliloquies, those communings with his own soul, it is given to know much more, to "pluck," as it were, "the heart of the mystery," to apprehend the real tragedy.

The brooding silence which characterizes Hamlet at the opening of the play is not hard to understand. It is the product of his father's sudden death, his mother's o'erhasty marriage, and the presence of a hated interloper on the throne. The first words he utters, in reply to Claudius' kindly overture, "a little more than kin and less than kind," reveal his bitterness of soul and his uncompromising attitude toward the usurping king. These feelings are intensified as the action progresses.

We must remember the situation at Elsinore. Called from the scholastic quiet of Wittenberg by his father's sudden death, and while still observing the formal period of mourning, Hamlet is horrified by his mother's unseemly marriage. His sensitive nature, already chastened by the loss of a dear father, is unspeakably shocked by the callousness and infidelity of a mother whom, we must believe, he had from boyhood respected and loved. Horribly disillusioned, and now keenly alive to the artificiality and hollowness of life as it confronts him at the Danish court, he is driven in upon himself, the moody, brooding, ironical Hamlet of the opening scene. At this junc-

ture comes the news of the ghostly apparition, seen by the officers of the watch and by his trusted friend, Horatio. "My father's spirit in arms!" he ejaculates. "All is not well; I doubt some foul play." Afterward, in the midnight colloquy on the wind-swept platform beneath the castle walls, when he hears the dread account of his father's taking off, he cries, "O my prophetic soul! my uncle!" Having rightly jumped to this conclusion, he forthwith assumes his mother's complicity and equal guilt, degrading her to the level of "that incestuous, that adulterate beast" who had won her love.

A deal of ink has been spilled in the discussion of Hamlet's madness. Was he really, essentially mad, or was his madness deliberately and consistently assumed for the accomplishment of a definite purpose? That critics of the play have differed so widely in their views is of itself sufficient proof of the dramatist's art in handling this delicate theme.

That the madness of Hamlet is accepted as genuine by Polonius, by Ophelia, by Laertes, by Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, and, up to a certain point at least, by his own mother, Gertrude, there can be no doubt. This, too, according to the grave-digger's statement, is the view prevalent among the people. Claudius, on the other hand, is less easily convinced. He is frankly sceptical; and as for Horatio, Hamlet's bosom friend and confidant, there is not the slightest evidence in anything he says or does to show that he, for one moment, believes Hamlet to be really mad. In short, those who knew least, or who had least opportunity of knowing, believed him to be mad. He who knew more, Claudius, was somewhat in doubt. He who knew most, Horatio, habitually accepted him as a rational man.

To convince ourselves, it seems to me, we need consider only three points. 1. His conversations with Horatio. 2. The well-known scene with his mother, in which he challenges her to bring him to the test. 3. His soliloquies.

1. Hamlet's avowed purpose to assume the "antic disposition" is plainly enough declared in the conversation with

Horatio and Marcellus, which took place immediately after the first communication of the ghost. Excited as he is by the message, he seems at first beside himself. To his friends he speaks "wild and whirling words"; but quickly regaining control of his overwrought nerves, he binds the two sharers of his secret to a solemn compact. From this time forward the "antic disposition" is consistently assumed whenever it will serve his purpose. He succeeds, as I have said before, in fooling the majority of those upon whom it is practiced. Claudius, however, because of his guilty knowledge, is only partially deceived. Horatio, true to his agreement, keeps silence and always understands. In all the scenes that follow, Hamlet presumes upon Horatio's loyalty and his full comprehension. Only once, toward the end of the play, does he express regret to his friend for a previous outbreak, confessing that he had, in this instance, really lost control of himself.

2. In the painful interview with his mother, where he "tents her to the quick," and when, interrupted by the apparition of his father, who pleads with him to "step between her and her frightened soul," the terrified queen, now more than ever convinced that her son's reason is entirely gone, cries, "This bodiless creation ecstacy is very cunning in," Hamlet quickly seizes upon the word "ecstacy" and, in order that his inquisition may not lose its force, chooses now to prove to her his sanity. Hear his remarkable words:

"Ecstacy!
My pulse, as yours, doth temperately keep time,
And makes as healthful music; it is not madness
That I have uttered: bring me to the test,
And I the matter will re-word; which madness
Would gambol from."

This is admittedly a test well-known to alienists and not uncommonly employed by them in cases of like kind. After this challenge Hamlet's burning words sink into Gertrude's very soul. That she is influenced by them there can be no question; for, in her subsequent report of the interview to the

king, she endeavors to put the best possible construction upon Hamlet's acts, and in her solicitude for him makes a deliberate misstatement concerning his conduct. In the fencing scene between Hamlet and Laertes, she is an interested and innocent spectator; for Claudius, grown desperate, has not taken her into his counsels, but is now acting on his own initiative. She frankly encourages her son and, in her eagerness to show a mother's loyalty, drinks of the poisoned cup which had been prepared for him.

3. Most of all, however, the soliloquies help us to understand the workings of Hamlet's mind, to estimate the quality of his intellect; in short, to pass judgment upon his rationality. It is not only in the swift transitions from madness to sanity, which Hamlet executes at will; it is not only that he is a different man when all others have withdrawn and he is left alone; it is in the amazing play of intellect; it is in the keen perception of moral values, in the mental grasp of the situation, whatever it may be, and the clear, logical reasoning, that the soliloquies incontestably prove Hamlet, when he utters them at least, to be sane. We who are privileged to hear them know more about him than his own mother knew, more than his friend, Horatio, knew.

And yet, the so-called problem of Hamlet's madness we have always with us. Like Banquo's ghost, "it will not down." Herein, as I have before noted, lies the subtlety of Shakspere's art. In Hamlet he has drawn a man singularly susceptible to emotional exaltation and depression. He need only yield to a natural tendency, and he has crossed the narrow boundary line which separates the sane from the insane. To play the madman is so easy to him that he need only relax his customary hold upon himself and forthwith, to all intents and purposes, he is mad. That this tendency grows upon him in proportion as he yields to it, that the transition becomes easier as the play progresses, a careful study will surely reveal. Perhaps the most interesting illustration may be found in Act V, Scene 1. Interrupted in his last and, in some respects, most ingenious

speculation by the approach of the mourners following Ophelia's body to the grave, he no sooner takes in the situation than he gives way to the most violent fit of raving in which he has yet indulged. He not only outdoes Laertes in extravagant professions of love and exhibitions of grief; he even leaps into the open grave and there, above Ophelia's dead body, engages in a desperate encounter with her now distracted brother. Afterward, and this is the important point, he not only offers a free apology to Laertes for his outrageous conduct, pleading in extenuation his "madness," but, in a conversation with Horatio, he makes this startling statement:

"But I am very sorry, good Horatio,
That to Laertes I forgot myself;
For, by the image of my cause, I see
The portraiture of his: I'll court his favours:
But sure, the bravery of his grief did put me
Into a towering passion."

There is no hint here of an "antic disposition" willfully put on; only the sad confession of a dangerous tendency so often indulged that it has now passed, under certain circumstances, beyond all power of restraint. In other words, may we not believe that, if Hamlet's life had been spared, he would have become steadily and inevitably a madman indeed?

In this connection an interesting question has often suggested itself to me. Perhaps I shall be pardoned for venturing to interject it here. On several occasions, while travelling through Sweden and Denmark, I have been impressed by a phenomenon not unlike that presented by Hamlet's case. A man or woman, ordinarily sane or at least accepted as such, would suddenly, and apparently on the slightest provocation, break out into a sort of fit or frenzy, during which he or she would seem utterly irresponsible. No violence, however, would ensue, and after a time normal conditions would be restored. I recall, also, that Bayard Taylor, in one of his books of travel, remarks upon the Berserker-like rage which not uncommonly manifests itself among the inhabitants of northern Sweden.

And, again, it is worth noting that Selma Lagerlöf, the Norwegian novelist, in at least one of her powerful sketches of native life, has depicted this same strange obsession. That the long, dark winters in this northern latitude have something to do with the malady, there can be no doubt. But the question naturally obtrudes itself, "Did Shakspere, 'the myriad minded,' know of this Scandinavian trait? Was this the reason why he chose Hamlet, the Dane, to illustrate an interesting psychological phenomenon, to present this baffling problem?"

To return to the soliloquies, among the richest of Shaksperean treasure houses. They not only reveal most fully the mind and heart, the marvelous personality of Hamlet; we feel instinctively that, for one reason or another, whether wittingly or not, Shakspere put into them more of himself than into any other single thing he wrote, the sonnets alone excepted.

In Hamlet we have a man endowed by nature with rare and transcendent gifts. In pure intellectuality he is a giant, head and shoulders above all his fellows. In his relations with Polonius, with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, even with Claudius, his intellectual pride, resulting from this marked superiority, is very evident. All his interests and pursuits are those of a cultivated man. His mental equipment makes him his own best company. Hence he is most fully himself when alone. Then it is that he may indulge in his favorite pastime, speculation. He it is who, of all men, most fully exemplifies Matthew Arnold's ideal of the serious-minded thinker, the man who lets his consciousness play all about a subject until he has apprehended it in its entirety. For Hamlet is not afraid to see things as they are. He is unflinchingly honest in his thinking, being most severe with himself. He is a keen, impartial critic of things national and racial, having travelled sufficiently to get a survey and a sense of relative values. He is, in short, a philosopher, unfettered by a system, who has sounded the depths of human thought and feeling and probed to its centre the mystery of life.

His intellectual agility, his wit, comes out on all occasions.

In his quizzing of Polonius, in his badgering of Ophelia, in his sparring with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, in his equivoque with Claudius, in his merciless onslaught upon Gertrude, Hamlet is distinguished by his keen, incisive wit rather than by his sense of humor. Wit is intellectual, humor of the feelings, and in Hamlet the intellect is dominant. And yet, on the emotional side, he is most sensitive. His belief in the supernatural is very real, fitting him to receive the message from the spirit world. He is susceptible to love and friendship and to the fears that beset the soul, whether the intellect approves or no. When groaning under the "fardels" of this weary life, his thoughts turn to death, as to "a consummation devoutly to be wished."

"To die, to sleep;
To sleep: perchance to dream: ay, there's the rub;
For in that sleep of death what dreams may come
When we have shuffled off this mortal coil,
Must give us pause."

(Tis) "the dread of something after death,
The undiscover'd country from whose bourn
No traveller returns, (that) puzzles the will,
And makes us rather bear those ills we have
Than fly to others that we know not of."

His courage fails him. He yields to the normal human instinct. He obeys the stern mandate, "Thou shalt live," that actuates the being of us all.

Hamlet is unquestionably a fatalist, and in this he is a true descendant of that ancient German stock from which the Danes, no less than the Saxons and Angles, are sprung. Before the bout with Laertes, when Horatio would dissuade him from the encounter, he declares: "We defy augury: there is a special providence in the fall of a sparrow. If it be now, 'tis not to come; if it be not to come, it will be now; if it be not now, yet it will come; the readiness is all: since no man has aught of what he leaves: what is 't to leave betimes?"

Though Hamlet is, in a sense, beloved of the people, chiefly, perhaps, because he is at odds with fortune, though also, we

may believe, because of his inherent dignity, his native courtesy, the gracious manners that become a prince, he can in no sense be regarded as a popular hero or even a general favorite among his own class. From such distinction he is precluded by temperament, endowments, and tastes. His intellectual superiority, his habits of thought, his moral standards, his views of life, all tend to isolate him, to make of him a man apart from his fellows, aloof and alone. Such a man is often admired, he is frequently feared, he is rarely understood, and seldom loved. Of all his associates at the court of Elsinore, Horatio is the only one who gets near to him, who may be said to appreciate and know him. And yet, he was a man fitted for love and friendship, a man not wholly deaf to the sweet voices of honor, fame, and good report. How pathetic, for example, is that dying request made of Horatio, that wish to have his memory set right with posterity:

"O good Horatio, what a wounded name,
Things standing thus unknown, shall live behind me;
If thou didst ever hold me in thy heart,
Absent thee from felicity a while,
And in this harsh world draw thy breath in pain
To tell my story."

Had his lines, then, fallen in pleasanter places, had his environment been more congenial, we believe that Hamlet might have lived a measurably happy life, following always the path of least resistance and ending his days with honor.

The fatal weakness of his character Hamlet understands far better than anyone—even his best friend—could bring it home to him. It is, as he tells himself and us, in those wonderful soliloquies, his over-fondness for speculation. It is the

"craven scruple
Of thinking too precisely on the event,
A thought which, quarter'd, hath but one part wisdom
And ever three parts coward."

"And thus the native hue of resolution
Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought,

And enterprises of great pitch and moment
With this regard their currents turn awry,
And lose the name of action."

This luxury of thinking, this reflective tendency, he indulges until his will becomes so enfeebled that action is next to impossible. Indeed, we see in Hamlet the curious anomaly of a distinctly reflective man, who, when he acts, does so not as the result of deliberation, but solely on the impulse of the moment. Take, for example, that striking instance in Act III, Scene 3, where, after much deliberation, after he has fully satisfied himself of the king's guilt, confirming the ghostly revelation by the play test, after he has firmly resolved to kill him, the looked-for opportunity presents itself. Claudius, engaged in prayer, is off his guard and unprotected. Hamlet is quick to see his chance. "Now might I do it pat," he cries,

"now he is praying;
And now I'll do 't. And so he goes to heaven
And so am I revenged. That would be scann'd."

Having scanned it from all sides, his conclusion is:

No!
Up, sword; and know thou a more horrid hent:
When he is drunk asleep, or in his rage,
Or in the incestuous pleasures of his bed;
At gaming, swearing, or about some act
That has no relish of salvation in 't;
Then trip him, that his heels may kick at heaven,
And that his soul may be as damn'd and black
As hell, whereto it goes."

The opportunity is missed. From this point onward Hamlet has lost control of the situation and he, with the other creatures of fate, is swept onward to the final catastrophe. It is not, as he feebly tries to persuade himself, the diabolical desire to take the king while he is sinning, that his soul may go straight to hell, that restrains him from striking the fatal blow while Claudius is on his knees. No. It is the innate tendency to reflect, humored until it has become a fixed habit, the disinclination to act, that causes him to hesitate, to procrastinate, and so to miss the psychological moment.

When later, impelled by wild impulse, he drives his rapier through the arras, slaying, instead of Claudius, the old eavesdropper Polonius, this is the first act in the tragedy of violence and blood which follows. Next comes Ophelia's madness and suicide; after it, Laertes' insurrection. And so, "one woe treads upon another's heel;" "sorrows come not single spies, but in battalions;" until, at last, in the second scene of the fifth act, Nemesis completes her awful work. Gertrude drinks of the poisoned cup; Hamlet, Laertes, and Claudius himself fall at the point of the envenomed sword; news arrives from England of the successful taking off of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern. The tragedy of blood is complete. Call it Nemesis, as did the Greeks, or call it Fate, as did our Saxon forebears, the outcome is alike inevitable, the lesson is one and the same. "The doer must dree his wierd." The sinner must pay the penalty of his sin.

Nevertheless, bloody as it is, the play of *Hamlet* is not essentially a tragedy of blood. The real tragedy of this soul-moving drama must be defined in other terms. It is not the shedding of blood that stirs within us so powerfully the emotions of "pity" and "terror," which, according to Aristotle, is the supreme end of tragedy. No. Shudder as we may at the general havoc wrought in the closing scene, it is the fate of Hamlet that wrings our very heart of hearts. And here we enter the region of ethics. The real tragedy in Shakspere's immortal masterpiece is the downfall of a noble nature, the ruin of a great soul. Strange to say, it was Ophelia who, though with different intent and moved by a wrongly interpreted incident, spoke early in the play the words that form a fitting eulogy over the body of the dead prince:

"O, what a noble mind is here o'erthrown!
The courtier's, soldier's, scholar's, eye, tongue, sword;
The expectancy and rose of the fair state,
The glass of fashion and the mould of form,
The observed of all observers, quite, quite down!
And I, of ladies most deject and wretched,
That suck'd the honey of his music vows,

Now see that noble and most sovereign reason,
Like sweet bells jangled, out of tune and harsh:
That unmatch'd form and feature of blown youth
Blasted with ecstasy."

Here was a man, well-born, the only son indeed of a reigning king, endowed by nature with brilliant parts, skilled in the best learning of the age, blessed in his budding youth with health, wealth, and friends; loving, and so far as we can tell, beloved by, a gentle, amiable girl, fitted like himself to move in the courtly circle; a man, too, of the student habit and cultivated tastes, delighting naturally in the refinements of life; generous, too, and magnanimous, the soul of honor, the pattern of courtesy. But, through a foul and ghastly murder perpetrated upon his innocent father, a circumstance entirely beyond his own control, a burden is put upon him, which, by the accepted code of that age, he is duty-bound to assume, but which he is totally unfit to bear. Suddenly the aspect of life is changed for him. The whole world seems different. Robbed by death of father, he is forced now, by circumstances, to renounce mother, sweetheart, friends, and academic pursuits. In the sickening atmosphere of a hostile court, he is driven back upon himself and, in his bitterness of soul, takes up desperately, but half-heartedly, the task which has been allotted him. That he should fail is inevitable.

Given, then, this situation and these elements, and the play of *Hamlet* becomes, in the master's hands, perhaps the most moving tragedy in all literature. There are in the drama incidents more affecting and catastrophes more harrowing. But in the grip of Hamlet's personality upon our sympathy, and the awful sadness of his blighted life and his early, violent death, there is not, I believe, another tragedy to compare with this one. Hence the enduring quality of *Hamlet*. Hence its so-called "modernity." Hence its appeal to the universal human heart.

VI.

PUNISHMENT.

BY THE REV. A. G. GEKELER.

There are two sources of knowledge in divine things, the book of nature and the Sacred Scriptures. Of these, the one is the original and unchanged autograph of God; the other is a sort of palimpsest, in which the divine truth is often blurred or distorted by the prejudices and limitations of the writers. Since these are the only sources of all our religious knowledge, we must turn to them for the truth concerning the divine mode of punishing sin.

Our notion of punishment is taken from the courts of justice and suggests an arbitrary and mechanical procedure. An authorized person, having the power to execute punishment, determines its kind and degree, if any shall follow an infraction of the law. If the judge or executive does not enforce the demands of the law, the crime goes without penalty. If he does enforce those requirements, he may select at his pleasure one or more of a variety of penalties provided for by the law. By an act of pardon the guilty may be spared altogether. Hence there is plainly nothing automatic or necessary or predictable about the punishments imposed by human tribunals. Everything depends on the arbitrium, the decision of some one other than the guilty party. The motives for the punishment also vary. The purpose may be purely vindictive, taking vengeance upon the offender, cooling wrath, as it were, by venting it upon the delinquent; or it may be reformatory, seeking to teach and improve the offender; or it may be a sense of equity and justice as in the retaliatory punishments of the Old Testament; or all these motives may be to a greater or less extent combined.

Such, then, is the nature of punishment as inflicted by men in their various judicatories. It was an easy and an inevitable step to ascribe the same motives and methods to God. Men could not help imagining that God rewarded and punished men in the same arbitrary ways. It was supposed, for example, that all kinds of evil and suffering were brought upon men by God on account of the transgression of His commandments. The penalties were not regarded as provided for in the very constitution of nature, so that they would follow of themselves, but they were considered to be an infliction from without and above upon the sinner. The classical passage, exhibiting this view, is in Leviticus 26. Here the transgressor is threatened with the most dreadful sufferings. It is one of the most terrible passages in all literature, but happily quite untrue to life.

Let us remember that the Mosaic law was only partly moral, while the rest consisted of priestly ordinances referring to ceremonies. It embodied all rules and customs which were to be observed in civil and ecclesiastical life. A neglect to keep one's self ceremonially clean exposed the delinquent to the wrath of God, perhaps no less, in the common opinion, than to break one of the ten commandments. It is as though a zealous minister to-day should declare to his people that, if they failed to observe the customs of Christian people, they would be made to suffer by floods or drought or fire or disease. "If ye neglect to say grace at your meals, or fail to read the Bible or attend prayer meeting or church; if ye fail to contribute to the support of the church or to the cause of missions; then will the Lord visit you with poverty and disgrace, with painful and shameful diseases and in the end with eternal hell fire."

This view is nowhere in the Bible clearly and finally abandoned. Some of the later prophets see the cause of natural occurrences, as drought, the destruction of locusts, the desolation of war, in the disobedience of the people.

"Bring in the tithes," says Malachi, "and there will not be

room in your cellars and granaries to store the products of vineyard, flock, and field."

I believe that Jesus had a different conception of punishment and boldly declared it, as in the case of the man born blind and of the unfortunates whose lives were crushed out by the falling walls of Siloam. Jesus said: "By their fruits ye shall know them," a statement as applicable to acts as to men; and Paul expressed the same view in declaring that a man shall reap what he has sown. Here a causal connection is assumed between the act and its consequences. But the truth was not thought out in all its bearings and to all its legitimate conclusions. For this the Bible closed too soon.

According to the theory we criticize, divine punishment is of the nature of a miracle. It is supposed to come to pass by an extraordinary action of God. Conversion in this sense is not miraculous. While in conversion God is certainly as active as in all the processes of nature, He is not active in an irregular manner. Conversions do take place in many millions of cases and in many instances the divine converting power is suppressed by the act of man. The Gospel in itself acts like a savor of life to believers and a savor of death to the impenitent, but this result is not brought to pass by immediate interference in each case.

The true theory, it seems to me, is that all acts are causes in themselves which effect their own rewards or punishments. Evil deeds necessarily have evil effects. This is not due to special divine interference but to the inherent force of the deed. The blighting, destructive consequences may fitly be regarded as the divine judgment on the acts in question. So far as we are able to judge, they are the penalty of sin and the sole and sufficient penalty. Conduct has its consequences in this life, and it is hard to believe that it will cease to produce effects in the world to come. I think it is in entire accord with the scientific spirit to believe in such punishment now and hereafter.

Take a concrete sin, *e. g.*, the breaking of the seventh com-

mandment. The consequences, in part, are immediately registered in the soul of the sinner: shame uneasiness of mind, some sense of the dissatisfaction, yea, the wrath of God. A sense of being stained, polluted, less pure and beautiful than before; a degradation of the soul and some realization of it; the loosening or destruction of the marriage bond. A stab has been made at the social life and well-being. Society has been grievously injured, and possibly a loathsome disease has been contracted. How keenly the results of wrong-doing are realized by the subject depends upon his character and intelligence, but they are there unmistakably. I believe that in such consequences of wrong-doing, affecting the wicked, and, alas, the innocent also, we are to see the judgment and punishment of God, and we do not know whether there are any further artificial or arbitrary penalties.

The punishment of sin, then, is provided for in the regular course of nature. It does not appear that there is any divine action in addition to that by which the world is constantly upheld and governed. Punishment is inflicted automatically. It is inevitable. If God should fall asleep, were such a thing possible, every act would have its appropriate consequences. God is not to be regarded as the great executioner.

This, I think, is the only view tenable to-day. It is of great importance that men should be instructed that they cannot divorce necessary consequences from their actions. No warning comes with such irresistible force to the conscience as the evidence that wrong-doing is absolutely sure to work injury to the evil-doer and to others. Under no other view are the sinfulness of sin and the majesty of the divine justice so impressive as under the knowledge that wrong works harm with the certainty and force of natural law. It is true, no one is able to point out all the consequences that may spring from an act; they may be more or less direful or advantageous, all depending upon circumstances. But enough of the fruits will sooner or later manifest themselves, to show the quality of the act and the justice of God.

If the Mosaic doctrine referred to were true; if God were wont to punish sin in arbitrary ways—then men never could know why they were suffering certain ills, unless in each case it were divinely taught them. Moses might indeed know why the Egyptians were visited with plagues, but the Egyptians would not. The view requires both that punishment should be brought about miraculously and that there should constantly be divinely illumined men able to tell men for what wrongdoing they were suffering. God would thus, while showing Himself a faithful Father to Israel, prove Himself a step-father indeed to the race at large, and make it forever impossible to establish His Kingdom among men. For who could receive and cherish the Christian view of God as the supremely Good One if he saw that God all along has been dealing with His creatures, not according to certain necessary and beneficent principles, but according to infinite caprice and whim?

Certain conclusions naturally follow from this view. If it is true that an evil act contains within itself, as a seed, its own punishment, then it is impossible to accept the doctrine that all the evils in the race are consequences of Adam's fall. The effects of the fall, then, do not come to pass in accordance with the principles of the divine government, but are entirely anomalous. In fact, the doctrine withdraws itself from the range of intelligent comprehension altogether. I do not suppose it has ever been taught that the forbidden fruit contained within itself a force or poison that causes death and all other suffering. It is usually assumed by those who accept the historicity of the story in Genesis that these results are brought on by a decree of God, and not by any inherent necessity.

There is a fair conclusion, I think, too, in regard to a certain form of the doctrine of the atonement. Some ecclesiastical standards and systematic theologians teach that the sufferings of Jesus consisted in enduring the penal consequences due to the sins of mankind and that herein lies the redeeming virtue of his death. It is vicarious punishment. Of course, if sin is punished not through the order of nature, but miraculously

and arbitrarily, then it might be conceivable that it should be punished in Christ in this way. If God deals with us not according to great principles of justice and wisdom, then there is room for any kind of unreasonable and capricious theories, and then it might be held that Jesus endured the penalty of sin. On the basic assumption that the atonement is beyond the sphere of reason, of course, the human reason and conscience can have nothing to say. In such a court they have no standing. A rational theory, then, could not be constructed and we must accept the doctrine, inexplicable and unverifiable, like a decision of the Pope, on mere authority.

I believe with all my heart that Jesus lived and died for us, and that great benefits accrue to us from His death upon the cross, especially that His influence and example have thereby been perpetuated and the establishment of the Christian Church made possible. But with what justice or upon what grounds moral guilt can be transferred from one to another, from one to all and then again from all to One; and that this One should be made responsible and punished in an unnecessary, arbitrary manner—I think this goes beyond the reach of human thought and imagination.

This difficulty is greatly increased when we see that each one receives a large portion of the natural consequences of his conduct himself. It is not justice, but a travesty of justice, to punish the sinner and his bondsman at the same time.

LIMA, O.

VII.

CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT IN GREAT BRITAIN AND AMERICA.

BY THE REV. A. S. WEBER, D.D.

THE PARAMOUNT QUESTION OF CHRISTIANITY.

From the earliest times of our era and without intermission, one question of theology has continued to be of paramount importance and interest to religious thought. It was first put, according to scriptural records, by the earliest followers of our Lord. In a moment of awe they inquired—"Who, then, is this?"—and their inquiry in varying forms has been repeated ever since by each successive generation of Christian people.

Our own is no exception to this rule. Whatever may be said as to the absorbing interest with which we are devoting our time and energy to material and commercial affairs, to historic and scientific research, the question which centers in the Person of Christ, after all, remains supreme. The reëxamination of it has indeed been forced into a new prominence by the subordinate interests we have been cultivating with such marked assiduity. We have mastered more fully the forces and resources of nature. We have acquired a sounder view of the universe. We have achieved a truer conception of sacred Scripture. We have attained a wider and more catholic religious outlook. We have won for ourselves a freedom that refuses to subject itself to traditional conceptions of Christian doctrine, the authoritativeness of dogmatism having lost its commanding power.

In these circumstances, it is plain, two things have become necessary: The fundamental question of the Christian faith must be reëxamined. The validity of the grounds upon which

we rest our confidence in Christ as the incarnate Son of God must be established by a new method of approach and apprehension. These necessities, it is, of course, gratuitous to say, are not as yet universally recognized. One finds, for instance, a distinguished representative of orthodox dogmatism affirming his conviction, that "the great battle of the twentieth century is a struggle between a dogmatic Christianity, on the one hand, and an out-and-out naturalistic philosophy on the other."¹ That means, so far as the doctrine of Christ's Person is concerned, that we must accept the deliverances of the ancient Councils as permanently authoritative, notwithstanding our knowledge of the intimidation, the bribery, the intrigue, and the bloodshed, by which some of the decisions were reached. At Nicaea, in 325 A. D., it was decided that Christ was truly God. At Constantinople, in 381, that He was perfectly Man. At Ephesus, in 431, that He was undividedly One. At Chalcedon, in 451, that He was unconfusedly Two. These metaphysical theories may still appeal to a certain type of mental habit, but it is certain that there are at present multitudes of simple, humble, Christian believers whom such subtleties of doctrine repel, rather than attract. These latter believers, instead of accepting the contention of the Princeton theologian, agree rather with an equally distinguished scholar who declares that "in the light of what has been called 'psychological hermeneutics' it must be maintained that Dogmatists reverse the natural order of Christian experience in coming to an intellectual apprehension of Christ's character and Person. Instead of opening, they bar the door of discipleship to many who are trying to find their way to a knowledge and acceptance of Jesus Christ."²

Paul, it may be granted, represents the dogmatic habit of mind, and supports the traditional view that the acceptance of

¹ Dr. Patton, in *The Princeton Theological Review*, January, 1904, pp. 135, 136.

² Dr. Peabody, cf. "Jesus Christ and the Christian Character," pp. 76, 78.

dogma is antecedent to knowledge and obedience. In the teaching of Jesus, on the contrary, obedience as a rule is the path that leads to knowledge. "If any man will do the will of Him that sent me, he shall know." "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, . . . him will I love, and to him will I manifest myself." Our knowledge of the principle enunciated in such sayings helps us to understand how Jesus could accept as His disciples, many a hearer, un instructed in dogma and untried in loyalty, and whose possible confession of doctrinal belief would not have been sufficient to admit him to membership in many modern churches. What was required of the early disciples was a willingness to follow Jesus as the way of life. Fellowshiping with Him on terms of personal intimacy, observing how He spoke and acted in their presence, making their own inquiries, receiving their own impressions, drawing their own inferences and conclusions—that was the method by which they came to recognize in the Nazarene an absolutely new and incomparable Figure and character, the incarnate Ideal of righteousness and truth, of goodness and love. It took a long while, and required unmeasured patience and forbearance on the part of their Master to bring His disciples to an adequate realization of the real nature and dignity of His unique Person. Instead, however, of dogmatically overwhelming their understanding by an authoritative formula of the truth and requiring them to accept it, He allowed each one according to personal peculiarities to work his way into the light. In other words, He protected the individual freedom of every man He was training. He forced no one in advance of his personal convictions. He knew that a mere doctrinal or creedal belief in His Divinity did not necessarily carry with it religious result. The vital belief in the same truth, acquired under the method of instruction He pursued, He knew also, is reached only as the result of genuine religious effort and obedient devotion, and that by such effort and devotion the important belief in His Divine-

Human Person may be confidently expected to become a practical personal attainment.

Now the one or the other of these methods must be followed by us in coming to an intellectual apprehension of the truth that resides in the mysterious Person of Jesus Christ. The dogmatic demands the acceptance of doctrinal statements as primarily essential, the vital insists upon a living obedience as the way to religious knowledge. The one emphasizes the dogmas set forth as the result of the extended controversies of the Ecumenical Councils or by the Confessions of the sixteenth century, the other lays stress on the teachings of the New Testament as verified in the experience of an obedient faith. The one is metaphysical, the other is scientifically practical. The one is established by a process of reasoning, the other is realized by a process of living. The one is accepted simply on authority, as a dogma, the other is known by the exertion of conscience, feeling, and will, in the pursuit of goodness and Christ-likeness. Comparatively few of the readers of the *REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW*, one apprehends, will find much difficulty in determining which of these methods is preferable or required.

Given the new conception of the Church and of the Bible which the results of modern historical criticism of the Scriptures have compelled men to recognize, the vital method seems indeed the only one that is left us to follow. "Criticism," says Professor Gwatkin in his remarkably able and informing study of 'The Knowledge of God,' "has demolished alike the Catholic assumption of an infallible Church and the Protestant assumption of an infallible Book." From this view but few competent scholars can now be found to dissent. "The old dogmatic view which invested the Book with a Divine authority," observes the Rev. Dr. Robert F. Horton, "assumed that every word was written by the Holy Ghost, and therefore established religious doctrines and settled religious questions by a comparison, or even by a quotation, of texts. But no power on earth can carry the mind of to-day back to that posi-

tion. The plainest literary facts, the most unquestioned scientific results, are against it. If a preacher attempts to maintain it, he can do so only by violence and vituperation; he brings the Bible and himself into disrepute. The old view of infallibility or inerrancy, of finality and completeness, has gone."⁸ What is true of the Bible is more pronouncedly true of the Creeds and Confessions. Their authority is likewise gone, and gone forever. The popular mind does not find in their dogmatic pronouncements any compelling power. What, in face of these facts, is left us as inquirers after the truth to do in order to assure ourselves, for instance, of the divine character and authority of Jesus Christ? How shall we as public teachers of religion commend Christianity and Him who is not simply its Founder but its Foundation, to the acceptance and practice of our fellow-men?

Before proceeding to suggest that the answer to such questions is to be found in what has above been called the vital method, in distinction from the dogmatic, let mention be made of a few facts which most men, whatever their theological perplexities and doubts, would probably allow us to assume. *First*, the actual existence in the first half of the first century of our era of Jesus Christ as an historical character. Testimony that is unassailable, because it comes from extra-Biblical and disinterested, if not unfriendly, sources—Pliny, Tacitus, and Josephus—makes this minimum of historic confidence in Jesus an unquestionable certainty. *Second*, the most general and superficial acquaintance with history compels this additional acknowledgment, namely, that this historic Figure, in the brief space of three years or less, teaching in a remote corner of the Roman world, produced such an impression that ever since His day, men have turned to Him to worship, and have found in Him the answer and the satisfying fulfilment of all their religious needs. After all these ages He is to-day exercising upon the mind and heart of an ever-increasing section of mankind such a hold that He can be described, as He

⁸ See Horton's "My Belief," p. 18.

was described by one of His disciples less than thirty years after His death on the Cross, as "the power of God and the wisdom of God." And *third*, that notwithstanding the changed conception of the nature of the New Testament, brought about by the critical study of it, there remain in the Gospel records indisputable historical data, guaranteed even by the apparently reluctant testimony of those whose critical ingenuity and scholastic ruthlessness in handling the Scriptures must often be deeply deplored if not indignantly condemned.

This last point is the only one of the three that needs confirmation, to show that we are here on firm ground. Sixty years ago we should have found the situation very different. Then, as Harnack tells us: "David Frederick Strauss thought he had almost entirely destroyed the historical credibility not only of the Fourth, but also of the first three Gospels as well. The historical criticism of two generations has succeeded in restoring that credibility in its main outlines, on which account the Synoptic Gospels are weighty, offering us a plain picture of Jesus' teaching in regard both to its main features and its individual application."⁴ A similar position is taken by other critics of strong and independent mind. Jülicher, for example, who identifies himself unhesitatingly with the liberal wing of historic critics, makes frankest acknowledgment of the historical value of the Gospels. "The true merit of the Synoptists," he says, "is that in spite of all the poetical touches they employ, they did not repaint, but only handed on, the Christ of history. As a rule, there lies in all the Synoptic Logia a kernel of individual character so inimitable and so fresh that their authenticity is raised above all suspicion."⁵ Even Schmiedel, whose notoriously rigorous methods are as thorough-going as his conclusions are frequently startling, after pointing out what he regards as having been imported by the Evangelists into their narratives from unauthentic sources, confesses that they contain, in their portraiture of Jesus, a solid stratum of

⁴ "What is Christianity?" pp. 20, 31.

⁵ "Introduction to the New Testament," p. 371.

historical fact, as the result of close and exact recollection. "All those statements in the Synoptic accounts," he writes, "which affirm something particularly great about Jesus, or put into His mouth sayings of marked significance, *must* be accepted as having the stamp of historicity upon them."⁶ Wrede, another so-called destructive scholar, to many of whose contentions one cannot assent, is equally explicit on the point under notice. "Whilst Matthew, Mark, and Luke are often writing out of the depths of simple feeling, instead of the logical understanding," he observes, "they were yet unable to obliterate their fidelity to the historic truth uttered by the creative Personality who was the bearer of the revelation that became the greatest force in the foundation of the Christian community."⁷ And Warschauer, to quote one more charged by some with a revolutionary bias in his study of the Gospels, makes this declaration, namely, that "it is a unique teaching and a unique Personality which we discover in the brief (Synoptic) documents—both historic, both authentic, both dynamic, and both together forming the supreme manifestation and instrument of the Most High, the power of God unto salvation." "The teaching of Jesus," he continues, "and the Person of Jesus are not detachable from one another: they are not two but one, mutually interpretative, a matchless amalgam. We see Jesus in these plain records, as truly, simply, lovably human, and as grandly, shiningly, majestically Divine. We see Him as One who had not where to lay His head, subject to hunger and thirst, acquainted with want and pain, with grief and death. We see Him, too, as the Teacher of ageless truth concerning God and man, Himself the Revealer of both, our Friend, our Brother, and our Lord. A more real, a more vivid, a more convincing portrait has never been drawn by supreme literary craftsmanship than that which looks out at us from the artless pages of our three earlier Evangelists."⁸

⁶ Cf. his article in the En. Bib.

⁷ "The Sources of Our Knowledge of the Life of Jesus," pp. 161, 162.

⁸ See "Jesus—Seven Questions," pp. 30, 32.

From these parenthetic observations, justifying the three-fold assumption of the historical reality of Jesus, of the vast effects that have issued from His appearance in human history, and of the historic trustworthiness of what is most essential to the Christian faith in the first three Books of the New Testament canon, we may return now to the questions as to what remains for us to do in our private search after the truth, and in our public advocacy of the religion we profess, if we feel it necessary to decline the acceptance of dogmatic statements as to Christ's Person, and to accord to others the same privilege.

These questions may perhaps be best answered by referring to the concrete example of one who had been stricken with dismay by the religious insecurity which modern science and Biblical criticism seemed to bring upon him, and who, after an intense spiritual struggle in darkness, after awhile by following the vital method we are advocating found his way back into the light and comforts of a living faith in the Incarnate Son of God. He has written the story of his emancipation, and published it in Gothic type under the title, "Wie Ich ein Moderner Theologe Wurde." At the suggestion of a friend to whom he had sadly disclosed his mental distress of doubt and unbelief, due to the new learning, he is led to take up his copy of the Bible anew, without any preoccupations of mind concerning it save those above instanced as valid and unsatisfiable assumptions. He reads it without any theory as to its inspiration, without any belief as to its traditional authoritativeness in doctrinal statement. He recognizes what plainest literary facts and ascertained scientific results have established, and lets the Book as a whole tell upon him precisely as he would any other book he might take up for study. He seeks aids to the proper understanding of the Scriptures just as he would in the case of any other work written long ago, in a foreign language and amid other surroundings. He surrenders himself to the "sweet reasonableness" of its words and ideas. Ere long he is taken captive by the Book. Its interest, its beauty, its variety, its charm, are entralling to a

degree he had never before realized. Presently it is borne in upon him that he is dealing with God, and that God is dealing with him through its pages. He discovers that from first to last, the Book is an incentive to seek God, to learn His will, to pray, to worship, to obey. He is led, when he comes to apprehend the Gospels, to recognize in the Person of Christ, who is their central theme, a revelation of God. God shows Himself to him in the face of Jesus Christ. By believing in Him, he is reconciled to God, and the Spirit of God speaks in him. The Book, he comes to see, presents Christ in so real and heart-some a way that he is constrained to give himself without reserve to His guidance, and thus he is transformed into a new creature. The Scriptures, their traditional trammels removed, are now more wonderful and authoritative than ever. Like Christ, the Sacred Book vindicates its own authority to him, and without any regret the baseless dogma of infallibility or inerrancy, which candor has obliged him to surrender, is no longer thought of, and the rest of the results established by reverent criticism are frankly accepted, and at the same time Christ acknowledged to be Divine.

This is the course which is recommended also, as its practical outcome by Herrmann's highly valued volume on "The Communion of the Christian with God." Those who have read it will recall how full a hearing it accords to the critics, and that it accepts their principal contentions as frankly as Gwatkin does in the statement that has been quoted. At the same time he is persuaded that the open-minded reader of the Gospels may discover in them and in a life of obedience to their counsels, the loftiest conception of Christ's Person and character. Making every necessary allowance for inaccuracies and discrepancies, for accretions and misinterpretations, the unbiased and obedient student of the New Testament will find this truth, namely, "That God manifests Himself by means of a Fact which enables men to believe in Him, and that that Fact, the only one in the whole world having the power of effecting this, is the historical appearance of Jesus as

handed down to us in the Gospels." Hence his prescription to read the Bible daily, systematically, religiously, with prayer for light, and with obedience to the truths revealed. On such terms, he feels warranted to assure men, they may be led into communion with God, to a knowledge of God in Christ, and to an inward experience of God in the soul.

If these representations rest upon solid foundations, as one thinks a practical test of them will show they do, the claim made for the vital method of coming to an intellectual apprehension of the mystery of Christ's Person has been vindicated, and our questions satisfactorily answered. The religious value of a belief in the Divinity of Christ thus attained, must surely be seen to be immeasurably greater than that which attends a belief in the same truth on the authority of a majority vote in a Council, or on any dogmatic statement whatsoever. So men who have passed from a dogmatic to a vital apprehension of it have really found it. Luther is an example. When he repudiated the authority of Rome, he declined to rest his faith in the Divinity of Christ any longer on the statement of the Creeds, and affirmed it to be an art, an attainment, through faith. In other words, by a personal examination of the trustworthy records of the New Testament, he grounded himself in the truth. He arrived at his conception of our Lord, as we may and as the first disciples did, not by taking the abstract idea of Deity, and asserting that Christ is Divine, but by taking Him as shown in the Gospels, and coming through Him to the idea of Deity. No man can first know God and then say that Christ is God. He first must know Christ, and through Him attain to a knowledge of God. "No man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him." One of the writers already quoted has well said that "nothing is more barren than to say we are saved by believing in the Divinity of Christ. We are saved by believing in Christ; the Divinity is an inference from the faith. We find Him Divine because He has brought us to

God.”* Our knowledge and experience of God are the priceless heritage which He has bestowed upon us.

Like the first disciples, we, when reading the Gospels, begin with the Man, Jesus—the Person who appears in their spiritual experience. When first brought into touch with Him through the written Word we may have no thought of what category, human or Divine, or both, He belongs to; yet He draws us. We believe in Him, we admire His life, we accept the value of His teachings, we accept His promises, we hearken with awe to His admonitions. The best that is in us responds to the authority with which He commands us. Thus, through this practical belief in Him, we become reconciled to God, become conscious of forgiveness, and have the experience of Holy Spirit in our hearts. In the phrase of the Ritschlians, we are led in this way to the belief that Jesus has for us the value of God, and to a recognition, as the next step of progress in religious life, that God is holy, merciful, forgiving, love. And since no other man has or can have this value for us, we put Jesus in a category apart, and give Him the name that is above every name. We call Him the God-Man, the only Mediator between God and man. Bound to Him, accordingly, by tenderest ties of sympathy and fellowship, trusting Him as He asks that we should, our hearts are “strangely warmed,” and a spiritual transformation wrought within us, under the realization of which as coming from Christ, we cannot long resist the impulse to exclaim with the once incredulous Thomas, “My Lord and my God.”

In addition to these general impressions concerning Christ’s character and office, the faithful pursuit of the method here proposed should yield a knowledge also of certain distinguishing particulars of His person. The first of them, likely to press itself upon one’s attention, is His unparalleled and commanding moral power. In whatever relations or circumstances we are allowed to behold Jesus, this note of forceful, effective, matchless strength challenges attention. It cannot

* Dr. Horton, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

escape the notice of any careful reader of the Gospels, that He was evidently Himself conscious of this impressive personal mastership and power. That alone is adequate to explain the quiet confidence, the lofty self-poise, and the undisturbed serenity that are always attending Him. In all the diversity of His relations with men, whether friends or enemies, one invariably hears in His words and sees in His acts the same self-assured security, the same unfaltering tone of authority. How great the difficulties involved in doing this may be in a measure realized by recalling what the accomplishing of His purposes required. "He had to relate His new doctrine," Dr. Forrest has pointed out, "to the beliefs and customs of an established faith, to pronounce judgment on the most sacred traditions, to retain, reject, transform, and to bear home His message to those whose hearts and minds were saturated with the faith which He had come at once to supersede and to complete."¹⁰ But He does all this without any hesitancy or doubt, without leaving upon Himself any haunting regrets or rebuking memories. Immensely positive and unalterably convinced as to the righteousness and truth of His judgment, is Jesus, in everything that He does or says.

That the several writers of the New Testament Books were deeply impressed by this characteristic, is quite as clear as is Jesus' own consciousness of it. Again and again they employ the word "power" in describing their Master's influence. "The multitude glorified God," says Matthew, "who had given such power unto men." "The kingdom of God," says Mark, "comes with power." "His word," says Luke, "was with power." "Thou hast given Him power over all flesh," says John. "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with power," it is recorded in the Book of Acts. And Paul speaks of "the power of the Lord Jesus Christ." Under their observation of this power of Jesus, inherently native to His Person, these early disciples must have felt, as we, who now read the historic record of their impressions, feel, that "the character of Jesus,"

¹⁰ See "The Christ of History and of Experience," p. 30.

to put it in Horace Bushnell's phrase, "forbids His classification with men." He visualizes and embodies the Divine. His unique nature is radiant with the indwelling presence of God. All who see Him, unless their eyes are "holden" feel in His presence as if they were "walking in hallowed cathedrals"—a feeling to which Charles Lamb gave expression in that saying of his so often referred to: "If Shakespeare or Milton or some other distinguished person should unexpectedly appear in our midst, we should all rise to do him honor; but if Christ were to enter we should all prostrate ourselves in reverent and adoring worship at His feet!"

Another characteristic deserving notice in this connection, similarly exceptional and impressive, is the absolutely sinless and perfectly holy manhood of our Lord. He did not at any point of His progressive experience deflect from the specific ideal which God had set before Him in life. "While Christ speaks as a man to men, and out of a deep sense of common brotherhood," Dr. Forrest says with incisive truthfulness and convincing force, "yet at the same time He does not occupy their standpoint. He addresses Himself to those who are outside the circle of right relations with the Father, but He Himself speaks from within. He moves quietly about among men, mingles with them in all the ease and variety of social relations, yet as one who breathes another atmosphere than they, who dwells in a region of unbroken serenity, at peace with Himself and with God. The holy love of the Father utters no word of forgiveness to His soul, but it utters it through Him to others. His joy is not that of the son who has wandered and been restored, but of the son who has never left the Father's house. This is the mystery of Christ's sinlessness."¹¹

It is true, attempts have been made to disprove the perfect holiness of Jesus by challenging His conduct in particular instances. In His boyhood, it has been said, He displayed a want of filial obedience. In driving out the buyers and sellers from the Temple, He exhibited an excess of passion. In the

¹¹ "The Authority of Christ," pp. 10, 11.

deliverance of the Gadarene demoniac, He unwarrantedly destroyed the property of others. And in His treatment of the Syro-Phoenician woman, He was harsh to the point of contempt. But all such objections are negligible. They largely rest upon an abstract treatment of certain elements in the case, and spring out of an ignorance, as Godet has conclusively shown, "of the precise circumstances which determined Jesus' action."¹² The full and final answer to all such cavillings is that Jesus stood self-vindicated after them all. Not a tremor of regret or self-reproach is discoverable in Him throughout His entire career.

The inference that must necessarily be drawn from this stupendously important and altogether exceptional characteristic of Jesus' life, corresponds with that which His unique power forced upon our attention. Very early in the history of Christian thought, a man of spiritual insight seized his pen and wrote out his inference in words that have carried the approbation of multitudes of Christians, "The Word was God." The problem raised by the fact of Christ's sinless and holy character, is neither fairly nor fully met by describing Jesus, in view of His acknowledged moral perfection, for example, as Keim does in calling Him "a super-human miracle,"¹³ or as Channing does in acknowledging Him "to be more than a human being."¹⁴ Such intermediate compromises, attempting to place Christ above men whilst denying His Godhood, are both historically and logically untenable. Such halting, half-and-half theories, fail not only in doing justice to Christ, but also, in deriving from Him genuine and efficient inspirational power and uplift for the moral and religious life. The acceptance of a real Incarnation of God in the Person of His Son, on the other hand, whilst affording a satisfactory solution to the problem of His perfect manhood, at the same time offers an intellectual rest, not otherwise attain-

¹² "Defense of the Faith," pp. 193, 194.

¹³ "Geschichte von Jesu von Nazara," English trans., Vol. 3, p. 662.

¹⁴ Channing's "Works," Vol. 4, p. 160.

able by us, when facing the mystery of the world, of the soul, and of God. All through the Christian centuries, therefore, there have been men, a continuous succession of men, who in the light of the accredited historical facts of the Gospel, verified in their own experience, have unhesitatingly and confidently affirmed the One sinless and holy member of our race to be Deity incarnate, God's adorable, true, and only Son.

“Thou art the King of glory, O Christ,
Thou art the everlasting Son of the Father.”

This estimate of Christ, in an age that emphasizes the thought of Divine Immanence and has the spirit of agnosticism as its intellectual background, should appear to be the more readily acceptable and intrinsically credible, on the one hand, and the more eagerly welcomed, on the other hand, as an adequate and successful answer to the naturalistic philosophical theory which holds God to be unknowable. The thoughts here suggested may well occupy us for a moment longer. Agnosticism, as it appears, for instance, in the popular and widely-influential philosophy of Herbert Spencer, has helped mankind to realize, that apart from revelation God is unknown and unknowable. Now, one form of heresy—increasingly prevalent in our day careful observers of the trend of thought declare—has always started from the assumption that a sufficient knowledge of God is possible aside from the revelation of Jesus Christ. Upon this assumption of knowing what God is, it has proceeded to deny that all the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in Christ. In face of the agnostic position, should not the heresy referred to, feel itself compelled to recognize that the God it knows, or thinks it knows, apart from Christ, is after all known to it only in and through the Son who has revealed Him? Gwatkin's great book on “The Knowledge of God,” to which earlier reference has been made, has rendered large service to Christian thought in pressing this point upon men's attention. The Unitarian heresy cannot rest its contentions upon theories which look for living power to a purely

human Christ, this writer says, for substance. Its advocates must accept His Deity, interpret God through Him, and worship God in Him, or they must seat Necessity upon the throne of the Almighty and worship that. In other phrase, choice must be made by them between agnosticism, pure and simple, and the assurance of Christ recorded by Matthew (11: 27), namely, that "no man knoweth the Father save the Son and he to whom the Son willeth to reveal Him." Once this is definitely realized, men should have little difficulty in determining what to do with Jesus.

And as an aid to the right decision, the doctrine of the Divine Immanence at this point proffers a service of inestimable value. According to the generally recognized truth of its claims, God is latently present in human personality as such. If this is so, one must feel constrained to acknowledge that the larger, the truer, the purer, the soul of a person is, the clearer, the fuller, and the more certain the indwelling of God must be. Our best knowledge of the Most High must be derived from the best of men. And if there is one man who is the best, a man spotlessly pure and absolutely holy, God will reside in, and reveal Himself through that man as fully and certainly as He can be revealed, and make this revelation for the guidance and salvation of mankind. This man, the Gospels of the New Testament point out to us, in the Person of Jesus Christ. For the first and only time in history, the Immanence of God becomes a perfect and transparent reality in the soul of Him whom Christendom has united in crowning the Lord and Saviour of us all.

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND.

VIII.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA.

In was an historic assembly, both because it was the consummation of a long preparatory process, and the beginning of a new period of denominational coöperation. Whatever the immediate or distant results may be, the Protestant churches of the United States have entered into new relations toward one another and have shown, in a concrete way, a unity of spirit in reference to the spiritual, moral, and social problems of the age. Such a gathering Archbishop Cranmer longed for when, in 1552, he wrote letters from Lambeth to Calvin, Bullinger, and Melancthon, urging "that learned and godly men, who are eminent for erudition and judgment might meet together in some place of safety, where by taking counsel together and comparing their respective opinions, they might handle all the heads of ecclesiastical doctrine and hand down to posterity under the weight of their authority some work not only upon the subjects themselves but upon the forms of expressing them." The questions then requiring solution were largely doctrinal; now they are ethical and social. Probably the way to doctrinal agreement is not so much by comparison of opinions as by working together in the cause of Christ and humanity. In substance Cranmer's dream has been realized almost four centuries afterwards and in a locality which was then a wilderness.

The personnel of the Council was an interesting study. Four hundred and fifty delegates, representative men of thirty-one denominations numbering eighteen million members, sat

side by side for a week. Baptists and Lutherans, Congregationalists and Episcopalian, Presbyterians and Quakers, Methodists and Reformed, Mennonites and Moravians—all dwelt in unity together in Philadelphia, a name appropriate to the occasion. It may have been a meeting like this of which John Calvin said that "he would not shrink from crossing ten seas, if need be," to attend. The spirit of Count Zinzendorf must have smiled with approval when he saw this "Congregation of God in the Spirit" in a far more comprehensive form than he ever dreamt of. The members in attendance were men of wide, frequently of world-wide, experience, who had borne the burden and heat of the day, and by word and deed had proved themselves workmen that need not be ashamed. There were bishops, moderators, presidents of synods, stated clerks, secretaries of boards, professors in seminaries and colleges, pastors and elders—serious, devout, intelligent, and aggressive men. They came together not to become interested, but because they were interested, in the spiritual, moral, and social welfare, not merely of their respective churches, but of their country and of the world. In times past there doubtless were greater theologians and scholars in councils, but they did not have a clearer vision of the scope of Christ's kingdom, of the essential elements of His gospel, and of the urgent needs of men in all nations. Discussions did not turn around a Greek iota, but hinged on the subjects enumerated by Christ in His reply to John's question—"the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good tidings preached to them."

The Council was authoritatively constituted. It was not a collection of individuals moved by good intentions, but without official warrant, to consider measures for the improvement of church or state. It was "a federation of denominations created by the denominations themselves." The supreme judicatories accepted the Plan of Federation and chose regular delegates for this, the first, Council. So far as Protestantism at

present can meet in an authoritative way, it did meet in Philadelphia. In this regard a long step in advance has been taken beyond any previous interdenominational or undenominational organization. The Constitution, indeed, clearly limits the scope of the Council, yet within these bounds its acts are representative and, by a later vote of the judicatories of the constituent churches, become authoritative. The subjects which claim attention, as well as the purpose of the Federation, are defined as follows:

“This Federal Council shall have no authority over the constituent bodies adhering to it; but its province shall be limited to the expression of its counsel and the recommending of a course of action in matters of common interest to the Church’s local councils and individual Christians.

“It has no authority to draw up a common creed or form of government or of worship, or in any way to limit the full autonomy of the Christian bodies adhering to it.”

In the limitations of the Council’s authority the rights of denominations are safeguarded and the ills that would necessarily arise from discussions of doctrine, polity, or worship are wisely avoided. The Executive Committee in its report calls special attention to Article 4 of the Plan of Federation:

“We believe that the great Christian bodies in our country should stand together, should lead in the discussion of and give impulse to all great movements that make for righteousness. We believe that questions like those of marriage and divorce, Sabbath desecration, social evils, child labor, the relation of labor to capital, problems that are created by foreign immigration, the bettering of the conditions of the laboring classes, and the moral and religious training of the young—concern Christians in every name, and demand their united and concerted action if the Church is to lead effectively in the conquest of the world for Christ.”

Some one may protest on the ground that the object is too indefinite and vague, that executive power is wanting. We reply that the genius of Protestantism, no less than the divi-

sions in the Church, does not favor coercion by external authority, but depends on "the opinions of men crystallized into common convictions as the source of ultimate power." The strength of the Council must therefore be found in the righteousness and reasonableness of its action and in the voluntary coöperation of its constituents.

What results, under these circumstances, may be reasonably expected? The cynic may sneer and consider it another project of a coterie of ecclesiastical organizers who find their work profitable and gratifying. The enthusiast may at once catch a glimpse of the millennial dawn. Few, if any, of the delegates were either cynics or enthusiasts. All seemed to recognize the limitations of power and a certain problematic element, but at the same time, also, the evident possibilities and the actual work already done. The meetings were not primarily intended for inspiration. Only ten minutes were granted to the speakers on the program to present the substance of their papers and the appended resolutions for consideration and adoption. In the discussion which followed speeches were limited to five minutes. The adopted resolutions will be sent to the supreme judicatories of the several churches for final action. Thus in a regular and legitimate way the Protestant bodies will be kept in close touch with one another, their common consciousness will be more clearly realized, and they will speak in unison on the great questions of the day to the world at large.

The possibilities of federation for efficient service in various directions were indicated by Dr. Sanford in his report entitled, "A Record of Three Years' Work." He cited a number of instances where the churches by united action were influential in remedying political and social evils in communities, states, and even nations. The United Church of Christ of South Dakota, by arousing public sentiment and appealing to legislators, was the principal cause for the removal of an evil that had become a national scandal. The New York State and City Federations played no small part in supporting Governor Hughes in his fight against gambling which was practically

legalized by the Percy Grey law. In 1905 the Inter-Church Conference passed vigorous resolutions in reference to the conditions in the Congo Free State at Washington. A letter, embodying the resolutions and those of the national ecclesiastical assemblies of the country, was sent to every member of Congress. With this message was included a letter signed by fifty missionaries representing the Protestant churches of the Congo Free State. The President and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations were interviewed. "In less than a week after the interviews a resolution was introduced in the Senate and adopted by a non-partisan vote that gave the President power to take such steps as he might deem wise in coöperating with or in aid of any powers signatory of the treaty of Berlin for the amelioration of the condition of the inhabitants of the basin of the Congo if inquiry revealed the truth of alleged cruelty." King Leopold did not wait for further inquiry, but at once opened negotiations that have transferred the care of the Congo to the kingdom of Belgium. While not all that is desired has been obtained for the oppressed and wretched people of the Congo basin, it must be conceded that "the united action of Protestant Christianity in Europe and America has brought partial relief, and selfish greed backed by imperial resources was compelled to recognize a power of righteousness that is the hope of nations and oppressed humanity." How much may be done in the way of moral influence on civic movements, social reform, missionary activity, and charitable work in towns, cities and states by State and Local Federations, will appear from what has been accomplished in the last five years. It cannot well be gainsaid that it is the most practicable and reasonable method for the unification and correlation of the religious forces of the Republic that has yet been proposed.

It is to be hoped that the Council will supersede some of the preceding interdenominational or undenominational associations and render the organization of new ones unnecessary. Their mission is ended because their work will now be accomplished in a far more systematic and comprehensive way. Let

them decrease, and let the Council increase. We have reached a limit in the number of societies, alliances, councils, and leagues. We are in danger of losing sight of the Church on account of the multitude of subsidiary organizations. We, therefore, heartily endorse the resolution that "It is our conviction that the plan of work which this Council will take up will be so comprehensive as to make unnecessary the further increase in the number of undenominational or interdenominational organizations for special work and will thus protect the churches from many appeals for aid which tend to dissipate the energy of the churches and to direct the stream of their benevolence from the regular and recognized channels." Yet about the time this resolution was passed a new organization, The National Lord's Day Alliance, was constituted in Pittsburg. Its aim is to unite churches to conserve the sanctity of the American Sabbath. A moment's reflection will convince one that no agency can do more in this direction than the churches acting through the Federal Council.

The watchword of the Council was federation, not organic union. This was emphasized in a number of speeches from the first to the last meeting. Denominationalism was recognized as legitimate and necessary. It has its basis not only in past controversies but also in the constitution of human nature. Doubtless there will be and ought to be closer union between members of the same family or type of churches, such as the Lutherans, Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians. The reasons for separation in many instances have disappeared. But Protestantism will always have its divisions, whether along sixteenth or twentieth century lines. There is far more to be feared from uniformity than from diversity. The one is often an indication of low vitality, the other of vigorous individuality. Federation recognizes the legitimacy of divisions, the necessity of tolerance, the importance of coöperation. Bishop Hoss said in an address: "We must not only recognize Christians in other churches, but the churches of other Christians." As American citizens we have inherited the idea of federation

in our political order. In the union of states each maintains its autonomy and is still loyal to the Republic. Indeed the State and the Union find their greatest efficiency in their mutual interdependence. If in the colonial era the Protestant ideals gave form to our political institutions, the debt may now be repaid when the churches accept the principle of federation from the civil government.

That the Federal Council is an earnest effort to obviate the evils of a divided Church and to correlate the Christian forces of the country in the interest of righteousness cannot be denied. That it is a panacea for all ills no one will affirm. It is after all only a *plan of operation*. The efficiency of the plan depends on the spirit of the churches which have adopted it.

If Christian men and women in the towns, cities and states of this country will work together in turning resolutions into action, and only to that extent, the Council will accomplish its purpose. Such coöperation will require common sense, hard work, money, tolerance, sympathy and aggressive local leadership—in brief, a sort of moral heroism which will face popular indifference, bigotry, cowardice, fanaticism, and ridicule with courage that is born of firm faith in the ultimate victory of Christian ideals.

G. W. R.

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

A NEW BOUNDARY STONE OF NEBUCHADREZZAR I. FROM NIPPUR. With a Concordance of Proper Names and a Glossary of the Kudurru Inscriptions thus far published. By Wm. J. Hinke, Ph.D., D.D., Assistant Professor in the Old Testament Department in Auburn Theological Seminary. With 16 Halftone Illustrations and 35 Drawings. Philadelphia, published by the University of Pennsylvania, 1907.

This book is by a minister of the Reformed Church in the United States, well-known to the ministry and laity of said church as a teacher and as a careful and diligent student of its early historical records. It was handed to us by the editor of the REVIEW with the request that we should write a brief notice of it. The book before us is an outgrowth of a thesis for the Ph.D. degree; "That part of this book which relates directly to the boundary stone of Nebuchadrezzar I. from Nippur was originally presented to the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Pennsylvania, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Ph.D." (first sentence of the author's preface). The part referred to consists of pages 116-187. The boundary stone, of which the author in these 71 pages presents a transliteration of the cuneiform text and an English translation of the same, together with a commentary and an introduction, bears a text of 155 lines. The stone contains also a drawing of the field in question and 20 symbols.

The form of its symbols, Nos. 3, 6 and 9, is comparatively common on the monuments, as is well known. As to the meaning of these symbols there is a divergence of opinion. At times these, like the "spearhead" of No. 1, are regarded as phallic emblems, "simulacra Priapi." Professor Hinke, with others, regards such symbols as Nos. 3, 6 and 9, as "scepters," and, possibly, rightly so. To one who has been among the modern Bedouin and fellah-eeen of Palestine for some time, these "scepters" suggest the quite common weapon of the Arab shepherd. These Arab weapons have the same general appearance as these oft-recurring "scepters" or "phallic symbols" on the monuments. These weapons are oaken clubs, running to a point at one end and ending in a round, heavy knob at the other. The general appearance is that of a large pin, whence the Palestinian Arabs name it *dibbûsy*, "pin." The same weapon in Babylonia is called *mikwâr* by the modern Arabs there. In Babylonia the knob frequently consists of hard-

ened pitch.¹ For the name compare ^٦لَّاْ, “liquid pitch,” “tar,” also “shoemaker’s wax.” The weapon ordinarily is less than three feet in length and weighs about from two to three pounds. It is carried by the natives on the right forearm in a horizontal position in front of the body, with the right hand upon the pointed end, while the end having the knob rests on the arm, extending somewhat beyond the elbow. As far as our inquiries went with the natives during our connection, as Thayer Fellow, with the American School for Oriental Study and Research in Palestine, we have not been able to learn whether they attribute a phallic signification, or that of a royal scepter, to this weapon. To the natives to-day the *dibbûsy* or *mîkwâr* is apparently nothing more than a simple effective weapon to ward off the foe, whether man or beast. Has this any value in interpreting these monumental symbols?

In IV. 10 *nu-gu* is, according to Delitzsch, “Assyrische Grammatik,” Sec. 138, 2d ed., from the root **ن** rather than from **م**; it may be that this is due to the printer. Likewise in the paragraph preceding, page 180 of the commentary, the Hebrew in question is **לְבָבָה** and not **לְבָבָּה**. On page 176, **רְבָבָה** is certainly due to the printer or proof-reader. There are, it seems to us, too many errors of this kind, not only in the printing or proof-reading of the Hebrew and of the cuneiform transliterations, but also in the printing or proof-reading of the English. There are in the entire work more than three pages of “Additions and Corrections” with an additional slip of “Additional Corrections.” There is occasion for a second slip of still further additional corrections. We shall however not enumerate, in this notice, these errors due to careless proof-reading; it is to be regretted in this case, as in every similar case, that a book thus marred should be allowed to appear with such errors uncorrected.

The part of the book under consideration, the thesis presented for the Ph.D. degree, is a scholarly treatment, making an actual contribution to our knowledge of the Babylonian boundary stones and kudurru inscriptions. The rest of the work (pages 1-115; 188-199), apart from the “concordance” and “glossary,” which together take up pages 200-313, is, in the main, nothing more than a partial summing up and registering of previous results of scholars working in this particular field of Assyriology. Or in the words of the author, this part of the work is offered “as a general introduction into this interesting field of Babylonian studies.”

¹ The existence of asphalt springs in Babylonia, from which asphalt issues forth in a liquid state, is well known to western scholars. For a picture of one of these asphalt springs near Hit see Clay, “Light on the Old Testament from Babel,” p. 94. The picture is a reproduction of a photograph by Haynes.

The work does not include "a discussion of all Babylonian boundary stones discovered up to the present." (So Professor Clay in *Records of the Past*, Jan.-Feb., 1908, page 39.) Professor Hinke himself does not claim to have presented a discussion of all Babylonian boundary stones discovered up to the present. His sub-title and a few sentences from the preface show this: "The attempt seemed . . . warranted to secure, if possible, a complete collection of all the symbols and to present them in the form of an astronomical atlas. This original plan, however, had to be given up, because the Museums of Berlin and London declined to permit the publication of the material in their possession, inasmuch as it had been 'reserved for publication by the Museum.' As a result the author was compelled to restrict himself to a collection of all the material that had been published thus far." On page xxv the author gives a list of "Unpublished Boundary Stones."

Professor Hinke's "Bibliography of the Babylonian Kudurru Inscriptions" consists of about two and a half pages. It is arranged under the following headings: I., "Text editions;" II., "Transliterations, Translations and Discussions;" III., "Description and Discussion of the Symbols."

There are suggestions here and there, which indicate that Professor Hinke has in this book joined, or is on the way of joining, the forces of the Pan-Babylonists of the "Winckler und Genossen" type. This appears for example, in the paragraph closing with the sentence: "As the prototypes of all earthly conditions are to be found in heaven, according to the belief of the Babylonians, so earthly temples had their heavenly models."² How far, and to what countries and peoples our author would extend the Babylonian "Lehre," and to what extent he would, for instance, dissolve the civilization and religion of Israel into the elements of this same "Lehre," does not yet appear. In a footnote Professor Hinke tacitly informs the reader that he owes this position to Winckler and his comrades. The foot-note reads: "Cf. Winckler, *Himmels- und Weltenbild der Babylonier*,"³ p. 12; Winckler,

² The contrary principle finds expression in the following: "Himmelsche Erscheinungen wirken weniger auf die Phantasie der Wilden als irdische tägliche, die ihnen ebenso mysteriös sind; das Ferne erklären sie vom Nahen aus, übertragen also irdische Gottheiten auf himmelsche Erscheinungen (nicht umgekehrt)." — "Man, I think, grew upwards from the earth to heaven, not like the drop of the banian tree, from heaven to earth. The old root was the first growth, and only after it attained to a considerable maturity did it throw down bright tendrils, fed by the riches of the aerial light, which had imparted to them warmth and moisture."

³ The full title of this work is characteristic of the extravagant claims of Winckler and his followers, and hence we give it in full, "Himmels- und Weltenbild der Babylonier als Grundlage der Weltanschauung und Mythologie aller Völker."

"Die Weltanschauung des alten Orients," p. 11; A. Jeremias, "Das alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients," ed. 1, p. 12." For an excellent characterization and criticism of the Pan-Babylonian school the reader may be referred to Professor Barton's articles* in the *Biblical World*, May and June, 1908.

To the Christian theologian and student of the Biblical religions there are some interesting practices and customs referred to and described in this book by Professor Hinke. We mention one of these in this connection, viz., the practice of attaching curses to these boundary stones, calculated to keep an individual or individuals from removing, altering, or marring them in any way. The curse on the stone whose inscription was translated by our author reads as follows: "Whoever [removes?] this stone, hides it in the dust, burns it with fire, throws it into the water, shuts it up in an enclosure, causes a fool, a deaf man, a witless man to take it, places it in an invisible place, may the great gods as many as are mentioned by their names on this stone, curse him with an evil curse, tear out his foundation and destroy his seed."

With these and similar curses Professor Hinke compares the passage in *Masudi*, the Arabic historian: "He who dares to change the sense of this book, to remove one of the foundations upon which it rests, to obscure the clearness of the text or to cast doubt upon a passage by alteration or removal, by extract or résumé, and finally who shall allow it to be attributed to another author, may he be the object of divine wrath and of swift punishment," etc. ("Kitâb Marûj el Dhahabi," Paris, 1861-77, pp. 22 f.). Professor Hinke might also have compared the following passage: "I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto them, God shall add unto him the plagues which are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the tree of life, and out of the holy city, which are written in this book" (Rev. 22: 18, 19). Furthermore, the Eshmunazer inscription in Phoenician might have been compared, as well as others.

A study of Oriental curses on monuments, boundary stones, in books, and in daily life, proves interesting and affords a glimpse into the life of the people. While in Palestine, among other things, we made a list of all Arabic curses that we heard in the land.

On page 179 on *li-tal-lik-su-ma*, II, 2, pret. of *alâku*, it is remarked that the meaning of the verb cannot be "to go," because the context demands a stronger verb than *alâku*, "to go." There

* "Recent German Theories of Foreign Influences in the Bible," pp. 336-347; "The Astro-mythological School of Biblical Interpretation," pp. 433-444.

are other reasons given. We simply wish to suggest in this connection the Arabic **عَلَى**, rather than **عَلَقَ**, which is used both intransitively and transitively meaning "to perish," "to destroy," "to ruin." See also Freytag, *sub voce*.

The work bears an improper and misleading title, since only a comparatively small portion of the book "relates directly to the boundary stone of Nebuchadrezzar I. from Nippur"; the title is "irreführend und wohl nur der Reklame wegen gewählt." Why the book, under these circumstances, bears the title it does, we do not understand. The title in connection with the contents of the book reminds one of the moral essays of De Chantereine, which, being at a loss to entitle, he finally called "The Education of a Prince." In the preface he goes on to say, that, though the essays were not written with a view to this title, nevertheless, the author should not be censured for the title, as the essays partly relate to the education of a prince. A title that would describe Professor Hinke's book more accurately and fittingly is the following: "A General Introduction to Babylonian Boundary Stones." The present sub-title might then be preceded by some statement like the following: "Including a study of a new boundary stone of Nebuchadrezzar I. from Nippur," or the present title with the sub-title, "Including a General Introduction," etc.

While in Egypt, as a member of the American School, the Hathor temple at Dendereh was one of the special places of study and observation. This study of the temple *in situ* was later supplemented at Berlin under Erman and at Strassburg under Spiegelberg, under the general subject of Egyptian Art. Naturally we turn to page 99, where there is a representation of "The archer from the Egyptian zodiac of Dendera." We read: "On the square zodiac of Dendera, *e. g.*, which dates from the time of the Emperor Nero, we see the same double-headed centaur drawing a bow, winged and having two tails, the lower of a horse and the upper of a scorpion." Judging, for the moment, from Professor Hinke's reproduction of this centaur-archer, it is not likely that we have here the representation of a horse's tail, for, in the first place, the tail is too long and has not the form and shape of a horse's tail, and, in the second place, the hoofs of the centaur are cloven! If the hoof is that of a horse, then it represents a hitherto unknown stage of development between protohippus and pliohippus! Is it probable that men, living in the time of Nero, would represent a horse as having cloven hoofs? It is to be regretted that Professor Clay, who reproduces Professor Hinke's illustration in his summary of the contents of Professor Hinke's book, in *Records of the Past*, allows himself to repeat the illustration and this statement without testing their accuracy. Professor Clay repeats after Professor Hinke: "In both figures we find a

winged centaur, drawing the bow, with a double head, one human, the other animal, and a double tail, one of a horse, the other of a scorpion" (p. 49).

We have something further to say on Professor Hinke's reproduction of this archer, but, before we continue with this, we call attention to page 177, where the credit of discovering **אַלְכִּי** in the Aramaic indorsements on the documents of the Murashû sons, corresponding to the Babylonian *ilki*, is given to Professor Clay by Professor Hinke: "Professor Clay discovered **אַלְכִּי** in the Aramaic endorsements of the Murashû tablets, corresponding to *ilki gamrûtu*, see B.E., X., 78, where **וּ** in the first line of the Aramaic endorsement is written on an erasure of **וּ**." Professor Clay himself, however, does not claim this credit. In his painstaking and scholarly contribution to "Old Testament and Semitic Studies in memory of William Rainey Harper" he writes, page 308 f., on this point: "To Professor Montgomery belongs the credit for suggesting that the letter **וּ** is written upon **וּ**. The scribe doubtless had the word **וּ** in mind after he had written **וּ**. This gives us **אַלְכִּי**, which corresponds to the Babylonian *ilki* written in the text." See also Clay on indorsements nos. 35 and 48.

Now to revert to the archer of Dendereh. On page 99, fig. 33 is said (on page xii) to have been "drawn from Boll, *Sphæra*, pl. II." This is not correct. If figure 33 was drawn from Boll's plates and not from *Mémoires de l'Institut Royal de France*, it is meant as a reproduction of the archer on plate III. of Boll's work. This, among other indications, is clear from the position of the bow-string in fig. 33; it is at rest as on plate III., while on plate II. of Boll's work the bow-string is drawn back to the bosom of the archer who holds the bow drawn in a strong tension. On plate II. the centaur clearly has only one tail, while on plate III. it may be double-tailed,⁵ as fig. 33. Now plate II. and plate III. of Boll's work are, however, reproductions of the same round zodiac in the center of a square relief of the Hathor temple at Dendereh. For the sake of comparison Boll presented two reproductions of the same zodiac. The former, plate II., is according to the "drawing" (p. 160, note 2) or to the "print" in the "Description de l'Egypte"; the latter, or plate III., is according to a photograph of a cast in the Louvre.

In connection with this round zodiac two other things are to be noted; its designation and its date. Professor Hinke is confused on these points as well; he contradicts himself on the next to the following page, and apparently does not understand Boll from whom he derives his material. Or is this confusion and contra-

⁵ "Auf der Photographie (represented by plate III) ist dies leider nicht deutlich; die Zeichnung in der Description de l'Egypte (represented by plate II) zeigt nur einen Schwanz, die bei Letronne, Analyse critique des représentations zodiacales de Dendéra et d'Esné, Taf. I, zwei." (Boll.)

dition due to a lack of proper familiarity with the subject in hand? The zodiac in question is properly designated as the "round" zodiac of Dendereh. It is so designated, *i. e.*, "circulaire," in the *Mémoires de l'Institut Royal de France*, XVI., 2 (1846), in the title of an article: "Mémoire sur le zodiaque circulaire de Denderah," pp. 1-101. This zodiac is also designated as the "round" zodiac, on Boll's two plates, II. and III., thus, "Runder Zodiacus von Dendera." On page 160 Boll speaks of it as this "Rundbild"; on page 163, note 3, "das Rundbild von Dendera," so also p. 166, note 1, also p. 169, also p. 177; and on page 161 "der runde Zodiacus." Boll also has this sentence: "Im Innern des Tempels [*i. e.*, der grossen Hathor] aber trägt die Decke eines der Osiriszimmer als Schmuck ein quadratisches Relief, in dessen rundem Hauptstück die 12 Tierkreiszeichen zu sehen sind" (p. 160). Now on page 99 Professor Hinke speaks of "the square zodiac of Dendera," while on the next to the following page he speaks of "the round zodiac of Dendera." The round zodiac and what Professor Hinke calls the square zodiac on page 99 are the same. Furthermore, Professor Hinke says the "square zodiac of Dendera" dates "from the time of the Emperor Nero," while on page 101, where evidently by confusion, though properly, he calls the same zodiac the "round zodiac of Dendera." He says: "Round zodiac of Dendera from the time of the Emperor Augustus."

It is the rectangular zodiac from the same Hathor temple, and not the round zodiac, which dates from the time of Nero, according to Boll (p. 159), and Dümichen, in "Photographische Ergebnisse einer nach Ägypten entsendeten archäologischen Expedition," Berlin, 1871, p. 27. Professor Hinke apparently did not understand Boll. Or does he have reasons, which he did not mention, for placing the round zodiac in the time of Nero? If so, how can he say on the next to the following page that the "round zodiac of Dendera is from the time of Augustus?"

Concerning the date of the round zodiac of Dendereh, we quote a sentence from Professor Hinke's source of information: "Dieses Rundbild (*i. e.*, the round zodiac) gehört nach Letronne der Zeit des Augustus, nach Lepsius den letzten Dezennien vor Christus an" (Boll, p. 160).

In the face of the above and similar matters upon which we cannot now enter, our confidence in the scientific accuracy of this "general introduction" is shaken, for, wherever we have tested it, we have too frequently found it inaccurate in statement and in reproduction of monumental representations. We regret that we cannot agree with Professor Clay's judgment, pronounced on this book in *Records of the Past*. We would not like to call it "a most excellent production of American scholarship." Much less

would we like to speak of it as Professor Clay does in the sentence from which we quoted the above: "The work which takes such high rank as a scientific contribution is a most excellent production of American scholarship, in which the author may justly take pride, for the volume will serve as the basis for future studies in this interesting class of inscriptions." In view of the results of our examination of the book and of this great unmerited praise we caution all users and readers of the same not to accept its statements and illustrations without subjecting them to an examination.

IRWIN HOCH DELONG.

DIE ETHIK DES DEUTERONOMIUMS. Von Georg Sternberg, Lie. Theol. Berlin, Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1908. Ladenpreis 2, 60 M. Pages 1-99.

The subject of this brochure, the ethics of Deuteronomy, as well as the more comprehensive subject, the history of Hebrew Ethics, has been given comparatively little attention by modern scholars. The subject was repeatedly urged by the late President Harper upon the attention of the members of his Old Testament seminar in the University of Chicago. Assuming for the time being that the ethical standards in Israel vary, just as the religious ideas of the several Old Testament writers are partially different and vary generally according as the writer lives in this or that period of Israel's history, he used to say again and again that it is just as important and desirable to study Israel's ethics from the historical standpoint as it is to study Israel's religious ideas from this standpoint. Since leaving his seminar (1902), this is the first critical and scholarly monograph on a part of this general theme that has come to my knowledge. Schultze's article, "Die Beweggründe zum sittlichen Handeln in dem vorchristlichen Israel," appeared as early as 1890. Giesebricht's article in *The American Journal of Theology*, Vol. XI. (1907), pages 31-55, presents a fine sketch of Hebrew ethics from the beginning to the period of late Judaism "immediately before the Christian age." This article is entitled "The Moral Level of the Old Testament Scriptures." It is perhaps not necessary to mention that this subject is generally treated, at least in part, by modern scholars (Marti, Smend, Stade, Duff,¹ and others) in treatises on the history of Israel's religion.

The work in hand is written for scholars and not for the general public. The reading of it presupposes a knowledge of Hebrew. Biblical passages, phrases, and words, are quoted freely in the original languages.

The following outline may serve to give the reader some idea

¹ Duff, in addition to his two volumes on "Old Testament Theology," has a small volume on "The Theology and Ethics of the Hebrews," which is distinctly popular in treatment. It was published by Scribners, New York, 1902, in "The Semitic Series." The price is \$1.25.

of what he may expect in this work. In the first part of the brochure, after an introduction defining the limits and nature of the subject, the author discusses the *theoretical* moments of the ethics of Deuteronomy. Here the following questions are raised and answered. (1) What is the ethical norm applied in Deuteronomy? or what is that in Deuteronomy which fills the sense of duty with a concrete content? (a) What is the ethical norm applied in regulating one's action? (b) In pronouncing judgment upon another's action? (2) On what is the ethical norm in Deuteronomy based or founded? (3) What emotional motives are used in Deuteronomy to incite human action according to the ethical norm of the book? We indicate here the twofold answer: (a) The consideration and employment of emotional impulses of a natural instinctive sort. "Da nun das Dt. nicht am Anfang einer ethischen Entwicklung überhaupt steht, so ist von vornherein zu erwarten, . . . dass in ihm solche menschlichen Gefühlsregungen, welche in früherer Praxis z. T. schon ethisch befruchtet sind, nicht ignoriert, sondern vielfach und gern in den Dienst seines sittlichen Ideals gestellt werden" (p. 42). (b) The employment of impulses that are specifically religious. The first of these is the "fear of God" (Gottesfurcht), and the second "love of God" (Liebe zu Gott).

The second part of the brochure discusses the *practical* ethics of Deuteronomy, or the moral and social life demanded of Israel by the ethical standard of Deuteronomy. In the first place are discussed the *public acts*, the acts of Israel as a community, such as warfare, national religious ceremonies, festivals, etc. Upon this follows a discussion of the acts of the individual Israelite as a member of the community in his *private life*: as a householder; as an owner of slaves; as a neighbor; as a creditor and a debtor; as a harvester and a vintager; as coming in relation with the birds and beasts of the field, with the domestic animals belonging to himself and with those belonging to his fellow Israelite.

On the last page, page 99, the author pronounces a brief judgment upon the ethics of Deuteronomy. The duty of love to one's neighbor, he maintains, is limited by the national particularistic idea. Personal revenge and enmity as a requital for injury received is apparently proper and legitimate. (Die Übung persönlicher Rache und Feindschaft als Vergeltung für erlittene Bosheit erscheint nicht als unberechtigt.) Other demerits of the Deuteronomic ethics are mentioned in this summary, but over against all these deficiencies the author emphasizes, as the chief merit, the fact that in spite of the external hindrances (some of which we have just mentioned), it presents in its time and environment the possibility of a grand ethical advance. Nor is this all that he would say in behalf of the Deuteronomic ethics in this general

summary and judgment. "Noch mehr," the author continues, "sie (die deuteronomische Ethik) hat geradezu messianische Bedeutung: Die Stellung und Bedeutung Jvh's im Dt als Erzieher und Vorbild für die Seinen hat Jesus Christus übernehmen können, als er den Grund für die Ethik seiner Jünger legte, durch das Wort: Ἐντολὴ κανὴ δόδοις ὑμῖν ἵνα δημιατέ εἰλλήλους, καθὼς ἡγάγος ὑμᾶς ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς δημιατέ εἰλλήλους."

We have already characterized the treatment of the subject as critical and scholarly. Those who mean to make a serious study of the subject treated in this brochure will surely give attention to this treatise. The substance is attractive, even though not all positions taken by the author commend themselves as able to stand the test. Here, to be silent about others, we mention the author's presupposition underlying his treatment that Deuteronomy was written some time during the Solomonic reign (in der "Regierungszeit Salomos nach dem Tempelbau," p. 7). On the other hand, the form in some respects is wearisome and annoying. In a short monograph of 99 pages there is no excuse for the employment of such an extensive system of abbreviations of titles and words, such as the author makes use of both in the text and in the foot-notes. The trifling amount of space and printer's ink saved by this device, it seems to me, does not justify an author of a work of this kind to inflict upon his readers the inconvenience of constantly consulting a list or indeed lists of abbreviations.

IRWIN HOCH DELONG.

UNBELIEF IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. A CRITICAL HISTORY. By Henry C. Sheldon, Professor in Boston University. New York, Eaton & Maines. Pages 399. Price \$2.00.

The author of this volume has written extensively on church history and systematic theology. He thus prepared himself to discuss so difficult a subject as the diverse forms of unbelief of the various schools of religious thought in the nineteenth century. It is a period of revolution, reaction, restoration, mediation, and reconstruction. It is needless to say that the current tendencies in theology and philosophy cannot be understood without a study of these movements in church and state. A number of monographs on this subject has appeared in Germany and England. The general church histories also treat the period briefly. There is room, however, for a treatise of this kind in America. The plan and method of the author will be most readily understood by a study of the table of contents. He divides the subject into three parts, with chapters, as follows:

Part 1: Philosophical Theories. Chapter 1, Radical Idealism; Chapter 2, Radical Sensationalism and Materialism; Chapter 3, Positivism; Chapter 4, Agnosticism and Anti-theistic Evolutionism; Chapter 5, Pessimism.

Part 2: Quasi-Scientific Theological and Ethical Theories. Chapter 1, The Challenging of the Supernatural; Chapter 2, The Denial of the Finality of Christianity; Chapter 3, Denial of the Transcendent Sonship of Jesus Christ; Chapter 4, Utilitarian and Naturalistic Ethics.

Part 3: Critical Theories. Chapter 1, Criticism of the Gospel History by Strauss; Chapter 2, Criticism of the New Testament by Baur; Chapter 3, Critical Reconstruction of the Life of Jesus by Renan and others; Chapter 4, Elements of Radicalism in the Recent Criticism of the Old Testament; Chapter 5, Elements of Radicalism in the Recent Criticism of the New Testament.

The material is appropriately and suggestively grouped under three heads—the philosophical, ethical, and critical. The topics of the sub-divisions are clearly stated. The tenets of the leading representatives of each system or school are defined and criticized. The author has evidently read widely and has thought profoundly. His conclusions are determined largely by his standard of judgment. In the Introduction he recognizes the difficulty of treating his theme in an objective manner and of testing the various schools with an absolute standard. He realizes that the personal convictions, preferences, and prejudices of an author will in a measure affect his judgment. He proposes to write from the Christian standpoint, and accepts what he calls the essential content of the Christian system as his standard. By this he means whatever can "be derived from the Scriptures by a fair exegesis" and for which also a clear support is provided in the general consensus of Christian scholarship. He accepts the theistic view of the universe. He regards personality as the highest category and knows nothing of a supra-personal God. Jesus Christ is a transcendent personality and came into the world to fulfill an extraordinary mediatorial office. Man is a free personality dowered with essential aptitudes for morality and religion. Any theory which makes man simply a part of a cosmic mechanism, a mere link in a chain of causes operating according to a law of mechanical necessity, abolishes the subject which Christianity contemplates. Finally, Christianity is conceived as not simply a name for a purely speculative system or body of ideal truth, but as an historical religion resting upon a basis of ascertained facts. Keeping this standard in mind the author tests the different systems by studying their fundamental ideas and then showing the truth and error in them. He also relates them genetically to those which precede and follow. The reviewer was especially gratified by the opening chapter in which he traces the history of speculative thought in Germany from Kant to Hegel. One will rarely find so clear an exposition in the space of forty pages.

The third book on "Critical Theories" will naturally attract

attention at present. In his criticism of the Old and New Testament critics, he follows the mediational or straddling method. He believes in the legitimacy of criticism, recognizes the valuable work done in this field, but constantly warns the reader against the results of criticism. He attempts to separate the wheat from the chaff. He takes up in order the work of Keunen, Wellhausen, Smend, and Winckler. All of them he considers radical, though he concedes that they represent various degrees of radicalism.

There are doubtless conservative and radical critics, but it seems to the writer that the time has come when in works like this not only the radical positions should be stated but the conservative and reliable results should be defined. It is not enough to praise the critic in vague generalities, and then to denounce his conclusions. The general reader has heard so much of that, that he is beginning to long for a clear statement of definite work accomplished.

In a brief concluding chapter the author takes an optimistic view of the final outcome of the nineteenth century scholarship. Christianity has doubtless undergone some changes. "A living religion, deep enough and real enough to meet the needs and to command the loyalty of an advancing race, ought to be able to secure and improve the position of one or another point in its content through such an intellectual engagement as that of the nineteenth century." While the conception of God, as supreme ethical person, has been brought into competition with pantheism, materialism, evolutionism, positivism, and pessimism, it has maintained itself and no permanent harm has been done to Christian theism. With all the critical and destructive work on Jesus and the New Testament, "the unique preëminence and lordship of Christ and the conception of Christ as central to the redemptive process in the world," are more firmly held than ever. The trend of exegesis has been in the direction of establishing the transcendent Sonship and the redemptive office of Christ as deeply imbedded in the New Testament. The primacy of the Bible, in the world's ethical and religious literature, stands out more clearly than ever in the light of a comparative study of the sacred books of the East. In the concluding sentences he says: "The Christian believer, at the opening of the twentieth century, should exercise his prerogative to go forward with illumined countenance and joyful spirit. No real barrier has been placed in the way of his faith. The outlook is inspiring. Never in fact, since the time when the revelator was entranced by the vision of the New Jerusalem, descending out of heaven, has the prospect for Christianity been better than it is at present."

A mere statement of its contents and general characteristics will commend this volume to the thoughtful American student.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP: ITS PRINCIPLES AND FORMS. By Rev. J. W. Richard, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Homiletics and Ecclesiastical Theology in the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, and Rev. F. V. N. Painter, D.D., Professor of Modern Languages and Literature in Roanoke College. Second edition, revised. Philadelphia, Pa., Lutheran Publication Society. Pages 368.

The first edition of this work appeared in 1892. It well deserves a second edition, for it not only supplies a need in the theological literature of this country, but it is a most satisfactory treatment of the history and the principles of worship. The authors acknowledge their indebtedness to the leading German authorities, many of whom are quoted in the text. The book, however, is by no means a mere translation or paraphrase. It has the marks of a thorough mastery of the material and of no small amount of original research. In the Introduction the nature of worship in general and its fundamental principles as laid down in the New Testament, are discussed. "The first five chapters are devoted to the era before the Reformation. They treat of worship in the apostolic church and in post-apostolic and mediæval times. The influences that corrupted worship and introduced an imposing externalism are clearly pointed out."

In the next six chapters the principles and forms of worship in the Lutheran Church are described. Chapter 7 contains valuable abstracts from Luther's liturgical writings. Especially noteworthy is the translation of the tract, "Of The Order of Divine Worship in the Congregation," dated 1523. Of this work Kliefeth said: "In this first word which was uttered by the Lutheran Church on matters of divine worship, lie its principles in full."

Worship in the Reformed Churches is treated in two chapters from an impartial standpoint. The difference between the cultus of the two great Reformation Churches is clearly indicated. The points of agreement are also stated. In the last two chapters, contributed by the Rev. M. Valentine, formerly Professor of Didactic Theology in the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, the following subjects are treated: "The Word in Relation to the Other Means of Grace," and "The Ministry in Relation to Worship."

There are many admirable qualities in this production. The material is presented in a clear, logical, and attractive form. Unnecessary details are carefully eliminated. There is little, if any, evidence of partisanship. The facts of history are presented without any effort to interpret them according to a pet theory. The value of the work is increased by the number of typical liturgies which are reproduced to illustrate the leading characteristics of worship in the several ages and churches. Among these are the liturgy of St. Chrysostom, used in the Eastern Church, the Roman mass, used in the Western Church, and the more important

forms of worship of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. The reader is able, in this way, to make a comparative study of liturgies and form his own conclusions. The quotations from German writers are aptly chosen and add strength to the argument.

One does not like to pick flaws in a book as satisfactory as this; but it may be well to notice what appears to the writer a departure from the customary historical and unbiased spirit and method of the authors. In the Introduction, pages 25 and 26, the following statement is made: "But without condemning the use of fixed forms, we find that they are of exceptional character, springing not from the essential nature of prayer, but from the needs of particular persons or from a spirit of formalism." The authors make no distinction between public and private worship. Written forms may indeed be more appropriate in the one than in the other. In our experience we have found that the free prayer "springs from the needs of particular persons" far more than the liturgical prayer. The latter usually contains petitions which are appropriate for the whole assembly, while the former frequently is composed of personal effusions of the preacher and is defective both in form and content. The sweeping statement which follows, namely, that "the world will never be converted by fixed forms of prayer nor by the men that habitually use them," does not, to say the least, improve the argument which in other respects is so judiciously presented. The reader might reply in the same spirit and say, "that the world will never be converted by most of the free prayers which are offered at the present time."

A singular omission is found in the chapter on "Recent Liturgical Movements and Tendencies." Reference is made to the new forms of worship which have been published in Germany, notably the Prussian liturgy; and to the "Common Service Book for all English-speaking Lutherans." A comparatively late liturgical production, "The Book of Common Worship," of the Presbyterian Church, is mentioned as an indication of the growth of liturgical sentiment in Reformed Churches. Not a word, however, is said of the forms of worship that have been prepared in The Reformed Church in the United States. It seems hardly possible that the authors are not acquainted with "The Order of Worship" and "The Directory of Worship" of this denomination. These have been prepared after a generation of careful study and serious controversy. They bear favorable comparison with any of the liturgies produced in America. If a third edition of this work is ever published, we suggest that a page be added to the fourteenth chapter, on the "Liturgies of the Reformed Church in the United States."

This book is especially valuable for preachers who desire to study the subject of worship. It is doubtless the most satisfac-

tory hand-book in English. It will also serve well as a text-book for theological students. The arrangement of the material will enable the teacher to use it effectively in the class-room. We cannot tell how widely it has circulated, but we feel convinced that, on account of its merits, the book should reach far beyond the limits of the Lutheran Church. It ought to be found not only in theological, but also in public libraries generally.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

THE FUTURE LEADERSHIP OF THE CHURCH. By John R. Mott, M.A. Student Department, Young Men's Christian Association. New York, 1908. Pages ix + 208.

This volume is a comprehensive yet concise discussion of the various phases of the problem of procuring more men for the ministry. The author is prepared in a special way to write on this subject. He is a virile, courageous, devout, masterly, and sympathetic fellow himself. He has lived in close touch with young men, Christian leaders, educational institutions and men of affairs for the last twenty years. For the past six years he has made special investigation in all parts of the world on the dearth of able candidates for the ministry. His sources of information are primarily the leading men in every sphere of religious work—ministers, theological professors, editors of religious periodicals, officers of denominational societies, in different parts of North America, Europe, Australasia, South Africa, and all the principal foreign missionary fields. He has met students in conventions, ministers in small gatherings, and held free discussions "with selected groups of young men planning to devote their lives to teaching, law, medicine, literature, engineering and other lay pursuits." The information gathered in this way has been supplemented by material drawn from the proceedings of the ecclesiastical gatherings, the year books and the periodicals of all the leading denominations of the United States and Canada, as well as from the reports of societies dealing with questions bearing on candidates for the ministry, covering a period of one, and in some cases, two or three generations. As a result of this wide experience and thorough acquaintance with the conditions in the churches everywhere, the author speaks with authority, does not present theories but facts, and suggests remedies that are practicable, sane, and tried. His generalizations are carefully and sparingly drawn, well-balanced and convincing. The tone of the book is encouraging, hope-inspiring, optimistic, and energizing, in spite of the fact that the shortcomings of the Church and the sins of the world are in no way concealed.

The contents are divided into five chapters: The Problem; the Urgency; the Obstacles; The Favoring Influences; the Propa-

ganda. The plea, not only for more men, but "more men of the highest qualifications," is constantly made. What is meant by men of ability is described in a classic passage on page eleven. That there is an actual decline in the number of candidates for the sacred office, he clearly shows by recently gathered statistics. That the same conditions confront the Church in a greater or lesser degree in all lands, adds seriousness to the situation. The only exception is the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa, which for many years has had a remarkable record. "In no part of the world," says Mr. Mott, "in fact not even in Scotland, have I found a church which in recent years has succeeded in attracting to the ministry so many of the finest type of its young men."

The pressing need for men of leadership is due to the complexity, intensity, and variety of the life of this age. It is this that made Philips Brooks, shortly before his death, say: "I want to live. The next twenty years offer greater opportunity for the Christian minister than any other like period in history." The prevalence of industrialism, the theological transition, the social unrest, the home and foreign missionary work, the overcrowded city, the depleted country, the immigrant, and the new settlements in the West—these all concern the preacher and in his hands is the power for the successful mastery and control of the new forces and conditions. The influence of his life and work will extend into every sphere of individual and social activity. The student of history will recall the work done by the Puritan ministers, including scores of graduates of Oxford and Cambridge, at the formative stage of New England, or by the itinerant preachers of early Methodism, in the civilization of the frontier settlements. Bishop Asbury and other travelling ministers of his day, inculcated respect for law and held up high ideals of Christian citizenship in the new States which they visited. "What does not Ohio owe to the fact that in its plastic period men like Lyman Beecher, Charles G. Finney, and James Hoge identified themselves with its life. Think of the influence wielded by the band of eleven Yale men who in 1829 went out to plant civilization in northern and central Illinois; and of the impress of the Andover Band of nine men on the Commonwealth of Iowa in its early history."

The obstacles which keep men from the ministry are enumerated in order. The materialistic spirit, the lack of family training, preferences for other callings in which to serve God, courses of study in colleges which automatically lead men from the ministry, the fear of sacrificing individual freedom and freedom of expression, the shortcomings of ministers, the granting of aid to poor students, the dead line and the lack of proper support—all have a deterrent influence. In the judgment of the author, however, the greatest obstacle of all is the lack of proper effort to lead men into the ministry.

Can these difficulties be overcome? The author says where an actual quest has been made for men the result has been far from being "helpless and pitiful." Professor Craig, of McCormick Theological Seminary, calls attention to the fact that during the past forty years he had known two periods of marked decline in the ministerial supply of the Presbyterian Church; that each time the general assembly grappled with the matter thoroughly and appealed to the entire ministry to coöperate in meeting the need; and as a result the difficulty in each case yielded to treatment. As one of the favoring influences emphasis is put on the necessity of the minister magnifying his calling. Professor Austin Phelps thus speaks of the impression made upon him by his father: "He honestly believed that the pastoral office has no superior . . . To be a preacher of the gospel was a loftier honor than to be a prince of the blood royal. So pervasive was this conviction in the atmosphere of his household, that I distinctly remember my resolve, before I was four years old, that I would become a minister. Not so much because the ministry was my father's guild as because he had taught me nothing above that to which ambition could aspire."

The volume closes with a strong appeal to the heroic in men. Experience shows that the most difficult fields are most easily filled. Prospective tasks and hardships evidently do not keep men out of the ministry. A member of the Reformed Church Mission Board not long since stated that they were able to get more recruits for Arabia, their most difficult field, than for any other mission. In England the ablest men offer themselves for work in Central Africa, and that field was never undermanned. The call to heroism meets with heroic response. Make the gospel hard and you make it triumphant. If it is a choice between self-sacrifice and self-interest, the former will draw the stronger men. The highest call that has come to young men, as Mazzini has said, is "Come and suffer." There is a vicarious element in strong young men which needs to be called out and exercised. There is a deep truth in the words of Illingworth: "The pleasures of each generation evaporate in air. It is their pains that increase the spiritual momentum of the world."

In this volume the material and arguments that have been presented in periodicals, addresses, and sermons of the last decade are summarized. But it is more than a summary. Facts and figures are the crude material into which the author breathes the breath of life, stamps upon them his personality, and makes a powerful appeal to the Christian Church to martial all its forces for the successful solution of one of its most urgent problems. Ministers, elders, teachers, parents, and students ought to read this book. To circulate it in academies and colleges would be a

positive inspiration to young men to devote themselves to the supreme calling of God for service among men.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

EXPOSITION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. A Commentary on the Entire Bible, to be Completed in Thirty Volumes. By Alexander Maclaren, D.D., Litt.D. Third Series, Six Volumes. Sold only in series. 3 and 5 W. 18th St., New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price \$7.50 net.

This series contains expositions of the following books of the Bible: Acts, Vol. 2; St. John, Vols. 1, 2, 3; Second Book of Kings, from Chap. 7; Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes. In previous numbers of the REVIEW notices of the first two series of this publication have appeared. Reference was then made to the excellence of binding, paper, and printing. The fame of Dr. Maclaren's attainments as an exegete as well as of his lucidity, vigor, and elegance as a writer of English prose is vindicated by these volumes. The deep spiritual insight of the author, his power of delineating the inner life, and his ability of coördinating the deeper notes that are struck throughout the sacred writings are especially manifested in his expositions of John's Gospel. They will remain for a long time a matchless commentary of its kind on this greatest of New Testament books. The almost infinite variety of ideas and the constant freshness of thought are in evidence in each volume. The table of contents abounds with topics felicitously phrased and formulated so as to start new lines of thought in the reader's mind.

While the scope of the work is comprehensive, a high standard of excellence is maintained in both the Old and New Testament expositions. The student is usually satisfied. Even if he differs from the author's views, he cannot fail to respect him for his thorough scholarship and his firm grasp of the essential verities of the higher life. The text is not always treated extensively, but with rare facility he presents the central truths of a chapter and applies them to the life of the present age. Questions are raised and suggestions made which lead one to further meditation or research.

After having examined with some care the three series thus far published (18 volumes) our estimate of the value of these expositions has increased and we await with anticipations of profit and pleasure the appearance of the remaining series. The work ought to be in the home, the school, and the public library. It is adapted to the parent, teacher and preacher. It can be profitably used for devotional reading. The preacher will find it a rich treasury of material for sermons and addresses.

We wish to call the attention of the readers of the REVIEW to the fact that these volumes are sold by the Reformed Church Publication Board, Philadelphia, Pa.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

DAS WIRKEN DES HEILIGEN GEISTES AN DEN EINZELNEN GLÄUBIGEN UND IN DER KIRCHE. Erörtert von K. F. Nösken. 302 S. Berlin, Trowitzsch und Sohn, 1907. Price M. 6.50.

This is the second of the two parts of "Das Wesen und Wirken des Heiligen Geistes." The other part received notice in this REVIEW last year (p. 275).

As is indicated by the title the author first discusses the activity of the Holy Spirit with reference to the individual. He here observes strictly the divisions of the traditional orthodox *ordo salutis*. The remaining half of the book is devoted to the activity of the Holy Spirit in the Church, as manifested in the charisms, the most important of which is the gift of prophecy. Inspiration, the counterpart of revelation, is the chief theme of the latter part of the book.

In the Introduction the author undertakes a vigorous rebuttal of some criticisms evoked by the appearance of the first part of the work. He notices particularly the suggestion that the order of the two parts should have been reversed, because the nature of the Holy Spirit is best ascertained inductively from the facts of Christian experience. He insists that such a method delivers theology over to subjectivism, quoting with approval the saying of Wundt "that the position of one who attempts to observe his own consciousness is like that of a Münchhausen who would lift himself out of a morass by his own cue." This shows how little sympathy he has for the live theology of the present day.

He finds it necessary also to answer the question why it would not be better in the present volume to deal with the Church first and then with the individual. He fears to do this, being jealous to guard the absolutely supernatural character of the Spirit's work. The Church is too historical, too human; he could not think of it as mediating God to the soul of the believer. Here again his tendency is quite at variance with modern thought. Professor Nösken is ultra-Protestant and crypto-Calvinistic.

It is odd that a Protestant theologian, discussing the work of the Holy Spirit, should treat the Sacraments in one book and the Word in another. Are not these two in the Augsburg Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism so joined together that we cannot well sunder them in reflection?

Yet we would not withhold a just tribute of praise. However widely points of view may differ, one cannot but admire the author's scholarship. His notes particularly evince exegetical acumen and mastery of all pertinent German theological literature.

C. Noss.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. By Edgar J. Goodspeed, Assistant Professor of Biblical and Patristic Greek in the University of Chicago. The Macmillan Company. Price \$1.50 net.

This is one of a series of volumes to be issued under the general editorship of Shailer Mathews, of the University of Chicago, under the title "The Bible for Home and School." Of the series Professor Mathews says, "The Bible for Home and School is intended to place the results of the best modern Biblical scholarship at the disposal of the general reader. It does not seek to duplicate other commentaries to which the student must turn. Its chief characteristics are (a) its rigid exclusion of all *processes*, both critical and exegetical, from its notes; (b) its presupposition and its use of the assured results of historical investigation and criticism wherever such results throw light on the Biblical text; (c) its running analysis both in text and comment; (d) its brief explanatory notes adapted to the rapid reader; (e) its thorough but brief Introductions; (f) its use of the Revised Version of 1881, supplemented with all important renderings of other versions."

In the volume before us, Professor Goodspeed makes good the claims thus put forth for the series. The work is well done. The Introduction is excellent and scholarly, yet sufficiently clear and popular for an ordinary reader of the New Testament, who does not have any technical knowledge of New Testament science, to grasp. It gives just such information of the times and circumstances under which the epistle was written, of its occasion and purpose, as the reader needs to understand its contents. The analysis is good, and given in such a way that the reader will follow it without effort. The comments are concise, yet illuminating, such as the rapid reader will appreciate.

The volume is of the same size and scope as the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. If the series keeps up with the standard of excellence here attained, it promises to take the place for the general reader which that was intended to fill for the student. We commend the book especially to parents and Sunday-school teachers who do not have access to the more elaborate commentaries.

W.M. C. SCHAEFFER.

A SHORT GRAMMAR OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT, for students familiar with the elements of Greek. By A. T. ROBERTSON, A.M., D.D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price \$1.50.

This is an excellent hand-book for the student of the Greek New Testament. It is not as elementary as Green or Harper and Weidner, nor yet so minute and exhaustive as Winer, Blass, or Moulton. As indicated in the title, it is intended for students

who are familiar with the elements of Greek. Hence much that is usually found in Greek grammars is omitted. There are no paradigms. The usual matter on inflection, euphonic changes, and formation of words is wanting. Instead of it we find a discussion of the differences between New Testament and Classic Greek, and of special forms in the declensions and conjugations. The discussions on prepositions and on modes and tenses is especially good. The author has given us, what has hitherto been wanting in nearly all New Testament grammars, a statement of the relation of New Testament Greek to the Classic Greek on the one hand, and to modern Greek on the other. He has utilized the new light, which has been shed on the subject by the recent discoveries of the papyri in Egypt. "The Greek of the New Testament that was used with practical uniformity over most of the Roman world is called the Common Greek or *κοινὴ*." "The New Testament in general contains books composed freely in the vernacular *κοινὴ*." The significance of this fact seems to be kept constantly in view throughout the volume. We heartily commend the work to all who desire a convenient hand-book on the Greek of the New Testament.

WM. C. SCHAEFFER.

THE RELIGIOUS TEACHERS OF GREECE. By Professor James Adam, Litt.D. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1908. Octavo, cloth, 470 pages. Price \$4.00 net.

This book, its readers are informed by the preface, represents the substance of the Gifford Lectures on Natural Religion delivered by the author in the University of Aberdeen. While the book was passing through the press, Professor Adam died at the early age of forty-seven. One reading these lectures, every paragraph of which abounds in evidences of wide and painstaking research in the literature of Greece and of thorough acquaintance with its underlying philosophy and religion, feels amazed at what was accomplished by the author during the comparatively brief years of his life. Not only had he made himself master of that ancient literature; he was equally well informed with reference to what others have written concerning it and the interesting questions that are raised by Greek life and history. He was keenly alive to the vast influence that Hellenic thought has wielded in the subsequent history of religion and philosophy in general, and of modern civilization and Christianity in particular. He was an enthusiastic student in all their phases of the problems which he discusses, and the thrill of his enthusiasm is conveyed to his readers by his manifest love of the truth, his range of scholarship, his direct and simple style, his clearness of thought, and his felicity of language.

The initial lecture on the place of poetry and philosophy in the development of religious thought among the Greeks, presents a general survey of the ground covered in detail by the lectures that follow. Students interested in questions of Comparative Religion will find in these opening pages a great wealth of learning and suggestion, the permanent usefulness of which they will recognize at once and greatly prize. The poets and philosophers of Greece were seers who laid hold of whatever was divine and imperishable in the religious faith of their nation, and they consecrated it for all time in those incomparable masterpieces of literature which embody the national genius at its best. By pointing out the relation of those ancient facts of faith and religion to the religious conceptions of subsequent centuries, and showing their value and significance for Christian doctrine, Doctor Adam has rendered a service to contemporary scholarship which should command its hearty acknowledgements and abiding gratitude.

The large expectations aroused by the illuminating and inspiring character of the first lecture, will be found fully sustained and confirmed by the course of inquiry pursued in those that follow. He begins by considering first the *poetical* development of religious thought from Homer to Sophocles, and afterwards takes up in order the *philosophical* development from Thales to Anaxagoras — both these lengthy and discriminating studies arousing thought and imparting information. Following these inquiries, the teachings of the Sophists are taken up and investigated, whilst the concluding lectures are devoted to the consideration of Socrates and Plato. To the latter's views as the exponent of the archetypal world of ideas, theory of knowledge, principles of ethics, and doctrine of immortality, much space is rightly given, and the value of his contribution to the progress of religious thought appraised, thus making it more readily available to the ordinary student of Plato's philosophy.

From this bare and altogether too imperfect outline of the area covered by this great book, the breadth and importance of its scope may in a measure be inferred. The purpose of this notice of the volume and the space to which it must be limited combine to forbid one to attempt accompanying the author into the delineation of his thoughts, observations, and conclusions. Suffice it to say that those who will do so by giving these lectures an attentive reading will find them a liberal and rewarding education. Ministers of the Gospel especially cannot afford to remain ignorant of their stimulating and informing suggestiveness and instruction.

A. S. WEBER.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTER AND HIS DUTIES. By the Rev. Principal J. OSWALD DYKES, D.D. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1908. Octavo, cloth, 375 pages. Price \$2.25 net.

To the department of Practical Theology, no more important contribution than this has been made in the present generation. Principal Dykes brings to the discussion a rare equipment for the successful treatment of it in its various practical bearings. He has had a wide and lengthy personal experience both as pastor and theological teacher. He has a competent knowledge of the history of Christianity, and a profound insight into present-day conditions and of ministerial needs and duties. He has the literary qualifications that are requisite to set forth attractively and persuasively every phase of duty likely to be met with by the minister in the discharge of his office as the leader of public worship, the preacher of the Gospel, the administrator of congregational affairs, the pastor of Christ's people, and the ordained representative of the great Head of the Church. All these ripe qualifications are laid under tribute in these pages, and if any of the younger or older ministers of the Church can read them without being made the better and more useful servants of Christ and His Kingdom by so doing, it is difficult to see what could contribute to their betterment and usefulness in this regard.

As a non-conformist minister, Dr. Dykes has no sympathy, it need hardly be said, with the "priestly airs" that ministers sometimes affect, while at the same time he insists that it is their duty to maintain the dignity which should always attend their office. Quoting Vinet he says, "it is desirable that he should be recognized as a minister, or at least that one should not be surprised to learn that he is a minister." The becoming demeanor lies between extremes. "At the one extreme there is a peculiar clerical or semi-priestly air—be it hauteur, or primness, or an unctuous affectation of sanctity, or professional stand-offishness—which produces a painful impression on the spectator. Whatever he is, let the minister be a man, simple and unaffected. On the other hand, there is an opposite extreme; when the minister of Christ affects the layman, permits himself such an abandon of manner, eccentricity of gait, unclerical attire, loud bold speech, effusive demonstrativeness, unseasonable or excessive jocosity, and the like, as to betray him, if not into forgetfulness of his calling, at least indifference to its sacredness."

When speaking of the minister as a preacher, our author points out most forcibly what is necessary to give efficiency if not distinction to one's pulpit career. He is emphatic in his warnings against reliance upon homiletical magazines, ready-made "skeletons," and preachers' commentaries. "To make practice of this," he declares, "is to write oneself down as a commonplace, second-

rate preacher for life." Equally important is his insistence upon the minister's duty to make himself a correct and agreeable public speaker. "Is it unreasonable," he inquires, "to ask of an order of men whose main mission in life it is to deliver religious addresses in public, that they shall at least understand the rules of voice production, pronounce the English language with purity, enunciate their message in distinct tones, avoid grotesque gestures, and know how to face an audience with dignity and self-command?" With similar frankness Professor Dykes discusses also the requirements which a minister has to face in the delicate situations of the sick-room and the bed-side of the dying, his counsels concerning which we cannot stay to quote or comment on. He treats with fulness and enforces with effective quotations from other writings, the nature and meaning of public worship and indicates what in his judgment are the best methods for its proper and edifying conduct. Indeed it is difficult to think of any feature of ministerial life, public or private, that has not received due attention in this remarkably able and interesting volume. The author has tried to keep in mind, we are told in his foreword to the body of his treatise, "the actual requirements of candidates for the sacred office and of the junior clergy, and aimed less at formal completeness than at practical utility." And while keeping this aim steadily in view he has drawn his guiding principles from the New Testament and derived his illustrations largely from the past in the history of the Christian centuries.

To students and ministers, who in seminary years are devoting or have devoted the bulk of their time to theological disciplines other than that which is dealt with in this volume, this work on the "practicalities" of the ministerial office should be able to render a service of unspeakably great importance. It blazes the way for them to greater ministerial efficiency, and its wise counsels and helpful suggestions should appeal, therefore, to multitudes of young men desirous of making the best of themselves and their ministry. To the sympathetic and studious attention of all such, Dr. Dykes' rich and timely book is cordially commended.

A. S. WEBER.

INTERPRETATION OF THE BIBLE, A SHORT HISTORY. By George Holley Gilbert, Ph.D., D.D., Author of "The Student's Life of Jesus," "The Revelation of Jesus," "The First Interpreters of Jesus," "The Student's Life of Paul," etc. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1908. Pages 309. Price \$1.25.

The history of biblical interpretation is a large field. It deals with the principles and methods that have been used during twenty centuries of Scriptural study. Its importance is self-evident. For if, as we believe, biblical interpretation is the cen-

tral department of all biblical study, then the history of that interpretation is a matter of great importance to the modern student of the Bible. What can be more helpful in the way of bringing him to a realizing sense of the real value of our modern methods of biblical study than a knowledge of the entire process which has reached its culmination in our present-day critical, historical, and scientific method of interpretation? To write such a history is no easy task. For the strifes and struggles of the centuries have been fought with almost endless confusion around this question: "By what method and on what principles shall we interpret the Sacred writings of the Old and the New Testament?" Dr. Farrar's "History of Interpretation" has been practically the only book in the English language devoted exclusively to this interesting and, as Dr. Gilbert characterizes it, "neglected field."

In ten brief yet comprehensive chapters the author lays down the principles of interpretation that have prevailed from the days of Ezra to the days of modern criticism. He illustrates the methods of exposition in each period by many well-chosen passages. The book is not fragmentary, for through the whole volume there runs the idea that Scriptural interpretation, like all other phases of thought, was subject through the ages to the laws of gradual development.

The author shows that the Literature of the Classic Jewish Interpretation of the Old Testament was pervaded by a deadly literalism; yet in spite of its pathetic misinterpretation it gave to the world many rabbis gifted with deep spiritual insight. He shows how Philo's exegesis was colored by his philosophical conceptions, and characterizes him as "the master of all who have read into the Bible what they have brought from elsewhere." Perhaps the most interesting part of the volume is the section devoted to "The Interpretation of the Old Testament by Jesus." Dr. Gilbert claims that Jesus inaugurated a new period in the interpretation of the ancient writings of his nation. He did this by rejecting the oral traditions, and appealing to the Old Testament itself, going right to the sources; by interpreting the written law in a remarkably broad spirit; by "supporting his interpretations with appeals to the reason, the experience and the moral instincts of man"; and by viewing the Messianic element of the Old Testament as a foreshadowing of his life and work, but not as a specific prediction. The author takes particular pains to establish the contention that Jesus' interpretation of the Messianic element in the Old Testament was not based in an outward, mechanical way on a historical knowledge unlike that of his day and superior to it, but was based on his spiritual vision, his perfect comprehension of the scope of the entire Old Testament and

his unerring judgment of moral values. The author shows further how the New Testament writers departed from their Master in their view of the Messianic element of the Old Testament. From Clement of Rome to Irenaeus the predictive element continued to be identified with the heart of the Old Testament. Then came the Alexandrians with their allegorizing methods and their philosophic prepossessions. The Syrian School made some advance toward a scientific method of exegesis, and seriously attempted to find out what the sacred authors really meant. With the eighth century all independence in the treatment of Scripture disappeared. In the Middle Ages the Bible ceased to be a living book and was read, so far as it was read at all, through the eyes of the Fathers. With the Reformation came a profound spiritual reaction. Humanism, with its grammars and lexicons, introduced a new force. Still there remained the subjection of Scripture to the authority of dogma. The philosophy of the seventeenth century brought a reaction against the tyranny of dogma. Then came the eighteenth century with its work for a purer text of the New Testament and the beginnings of a scientific, historical criticism. Now we have the modern era of biblical study characterized by new freedom of research and the new viewpoints of natural science and comparative religion. The new method of interpretation, called Historical Criticism, has "as its sole aim to get at the facts and to learn their meaning." This has given us a new conception of the origin and character of the Bible, a conception rich in spirituality, for it looks upon inspiration as belonging not to material writings but to human minds and hearts, and looks upon revelations as identified, not with letters, but with the *lives* of men. Under this conception the Bible again becomes warm and instinct with human interest. The prophets glow with a new fervor as spiritual leaders of their respective ages. The character and work of Jesus becomes "the most conspicuous aspect of Christian thought." "The divinity of Jesus remains, but it is the divinity of character." What is needed now is the wide and fruitful application of these principles to the interpretation of all Scripture.

Dr. Gilbert's books are always lucid and simple in style. His language is free from technicality. He writes as a historian rather than as an advocate. He has the rare faculty of presenting the essentials of a religious truth without going far afield for irrelevant matter. This book is helpful and stimulating, a valuable addition to the many noteworthy publications of the author and we heartily commend it.

H. M. J. KLEIN.

THE PROGRAMME OF MODERNISM: A Reply to the Encyclical of Pius X., *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, with the Text of the Encyclical in an English Version. Translated from the Italian by Rev. Father George Tyrrell, with an introduction by A. Leslie Lilley, Vicar of St. Mary's, Paddington Green, London. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons. Price \$1.50 net.

This book is published anonymously for obvious reasons. It was written by certain Italian priests in reply to the Pope, or to the authors of the Pope's Encyclical, whoever they may be. An English translation of this celebrated papal pronunciamento is printed in this volume. One should read first this voluminous Encyclical, steeped in medievalism, and then the calm, frank, objective "Programme" in rebuttal.

It will be remembered that "Modernism" is the name which the Pope gave to that movement within the Roman Catholic Church which, in its last analysis, is the rebellion of the historical sense, incarnate in loyal Catholics, against the absolutism of the official scholastic theology of the Roman Hierarchy.

There is a striking analogy between the initial efforts of the Reformers of the sixteenth century against the paganism in the Roman Catholic Church of their age and between the modern revolt from scholasticism. Then, as now, the protestants nourished the fond hope of accomplishing their aim peacefully, within the bosom of the Church. We know that in the sixteenth century their hopes proved delusive. It remains to be seen whether there is heart-room in the Vatican, and house-room in the vast Roman Catholic Church of the twentieth century for these valiant pioneers in the enfranchisement of the life of religion from the scholastic shackles of the "angelic doctor," Thomas Aquinas. Judging from the tone of the Encyclical and from the repressive measures instituted by it, one fears that, like Galileo, whose reputed "E pur si muove" adorns the cover of this volume, these earnest, pious, truth-seekers must pass through much tribulation before reaching their goal.

Meanwhile this book, though written by Catholics for Catholics, should have a wide circulation. It deals justly with scholasticism, it speaks with amazing frankness to the Pope, and it sets forth its own position in a comprehensive and lucid fashion. We wish it well in its appeal from the denunciatory Encyclical of a badly informed Pope to the judgment of history.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

THE REPRESENTATIVE WOMEN OF THE BIBLE. By George Matheson, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E. New York, A. C. Armstrong and Son. Pages 269. Price \$1.50 net.

This book, by the author of "The Representative Men of the Bible," was published after Dr. Matheson's death, from manuscript well in hand, but not ready for the press. It was prepared

for publication by the author's secretary, Mr. William Smith, and the work is done in such a way as to present with the utmost fidelity what the author himself had wrought out for the purpose.

The character sketches are not intended to be critical studies. The author says he imagined himself standing in a gallery studying the portraits of female forms just as they have been delineated, without inquiring either into their date or the names of the artist. With keen, discriminating insight, from this point of view, he discerns the salient features of the different personages under review, and with masterly skill he describes their characteristics in the most delightful and edifying way. Rarely do we find sketches of equal interest and suggestiveness, and the book will prove a source of instruction and inspiration both to the minister of the gospel and the ordinary reader.

In the introduction the author contrasts the Hebrew woman with woman as she appears in the pagan world, and shows that here, in the Judaic Gallery, she is pictured as the empress of the home. The most striking pictures are in the hall of entrance and the hall of exit; the two are different in execution and unlike in their expressions; but in each the idea is the same—the enfranchisement of the feminine soul. Then he proceeds to show the process and significance of the development along the whole line of characters whose portraits are held up to our view.

The titles of the different chapters suggest in a measure the mode of treatment, and show how, to the author's mind, a single characteristic gives the key to the whole life of an individual. For instance the second chapter is on "Eve the Unfolded," the next on "Sarah the Steadfast"; then we have "Rebekah the Far-Seeing," "Rachel the Placid," "Miriam the Gifted," etc. One of the most thoughtful and suggestive chapters is that on "Mary the Guiding," in which the author lays stress on the fact that it was the especial mission of Mary, the mother of Jesus, to guide the earthly development of her son in such a way that the spiritual should not outrun the physical, and that his human experience should be normal and healthy. In other chapters, too, there are striking, sometimes startling, observations with which one may not always agree, but which afford abundant food for profound thought and reflection.

JOHN S. STAHR.

THE RELIGION OF THE VEDA. The Ancient Religion of India (from Rig-Veda to Upanishads). By Maurice Bloomfield, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908. Pages xv + 300. Price \$1.50 net.

This is the seventh volume of the American Lectures on the History of Religions, the previous volumes having been devoted

to Primitive Religions, Religions of the Ancient Egyptians, Religion of Israel (two), Buddhism and Religion in Japan. The author of this last is the compiler of the great Vedic Concordance that appeared recently in the Harvard Oriental Series and has published a great deal of material pertaining to his specialty, particularly the Atharva-Veda.

The book before us consists of popular lectures delivered at various theological seminaries and other institutions. The author's long endeavors to make ancient Indian classics intelligible to modern Americans have developed in him a disposition to disregard conventionalities of speech. For instance: "In order to accomplish the slaughter of the arch-dragon Vritra he (Indra) drank on one occasion three lakes of that delightful beverage, so that decidedly he had a jag on, which, it has been noted, rhymes well with dragon." "Indra performs in his professional capacity of Hercules a large assortment of other 'stunts.'" Such expressions are calculated to captivate an audience of students, but do not look well in print. Yet these very extravagances of expression indicate the luminous and interesting style of the book as a whole.

Dr. Bloomfield's critical views are characterized by a moderation that commends them to the inexpert. In the Vedic poems he recognizes the combination of genuine religious inspirations on the one hand and mercenary heathenish motives on the other. He resists both the ethnological explanations of Oldenberg and the fanciful interpretations of Max Müller. He confesses ignorance of the chronology of the Vedas, excepting the fact that the Vedic period came to an end about 700 B. C.

The doctrine that is characteristic of the newest stratum, the Upanishads, has two main features. Its monism, which finds the ground of all things in the absolute Brahma-Atman, is foreshadowed in poems which, we have reason to believe, belong to the oldest stratum. The other feature—pessimism, metempsychosis, karma, etc.—is new. The author finds the cause of this peculiar pessimistic turn of thought in the effect of the climate of India on the Aryan invaders. "Hypochondria, melancholia, dyspepsia—call it what we may—conquered the conquering Aryan, whose stock was no doubt the product of a more northerly and invigorating climate."

For a beginner the book is a boon. Difficult names and concepts are explained in a very satisfactory manner, and the effect of the whole discussion is to arouse a desire for more intimate acquaintance with the subject. The Vedas have determined the dominant tone of the religious life of the Orient. In them lie the roots of the highest religious culture of India, China and

Japan. He who makes us better acquainted with them does us a great service.

C. Noss.

PAUL THE MYSTIC, A Study in Apostolic Experience. By James M. Campbell, D.D. New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons. Pp. 285. \$1.50 net.

Mysticism, to many minds, suggests the absence of clear and definite ideas, and is, therefore, to say the least, a synonym for vagueness and confusion of thought. Dr. Moberly, on the other hand, declares that the word mysticism has had a noble history, and, although it has been used to express a disproportion, he holds that "the spirit of mysticism is the true and essential Christianity. . . . It is the realization of human personality as characterized by and communicated in the indwelling reality of the Spirit of Christ, which is God." It is quite legitimate, therefore, to assume that there are mystics and mystics, and that, when a man is called a mystic, it is important to inquire in what sense the term may be properly applied to him.

St. Paul may not inappropriately be called the logician of the New Testament. His writings abound in clear statement and keen reasoning. Nowhere else do we find the doctrinal aspect of Christianity set forth in more striking form and clearer outline or a stronger presentation of the rationality of Christian doctrine. And yet, at the same time there is abundant evidence in all his writings of the fact that he recognizes in Christianity an element which transcends human thought and human language, that the revelation of God in Christ Jesus is a mystery which reaches far beyond the limitations of the human reason, and that in his own personal experience there are facts and factors which he cannot explain even to himself, much less to others. It is not without reason, therefore, that Dr. Campbell calls him a mystic—"not a pure mystic, for he was many things besides." "As a mystic Paul was one who dwelt upon the inner side of spiritual things; one who pushed on where logic limped and lagged, seeking the sunlit heights of direct vision, conscious union, and direct communion" (p. 5).

This description of Paul's mysticism at once shows, in a general way, the nature of it and the sphere of its manifestation. It is not philosophical or speculative, but religious and practical, necessarily involved in the subject-matter with which he deals. Dr. Campbell accordingly, in successive chapters treats of him as a Religious Mystic, a Christian Mystic, an Evangelical Mystic, a Rational Mystic, and a Practical Mystic, and finally discusses the Message of Paul the Mystic to the Church of To-day.

This book may, without hesitation, be recommended both to the

theologian and to the general reader. A careful study of it will not only be most helpful to the mastery of St. Paul's doctrinal system, but it will also serve to throw a strong light upon the nature of Christianity itself. The historical method of the study of the New Testament needs to be complemented by the recognition of a living Christ, and the working of His Spirit in our hearts; and this volume will serve an excellent purpose in emphasizing this factor of our common human experience.

JOHN S. STAHR.

DIE BEDEUTUNG DER CONCUPISCENZ IN LUTHERS LEBEN UND LEHRE. Von Wilhelm Brann, Lic. Theol. Berlin, Trowitsch & Sohn. Pp. 312. 4./5.

This treatise, which gives evidence on almost every page of patient research and real German thoroughness, is on a subject which, at first sight, might seem to be of little interest to the theologian of the present day. But if Christian doctrine is based on Christian experience, an inquiry, such as this, into the details of Luther's life and experience in the cloister and before he came to formulate the doctrine of God's free grace and salvation by faith alone without the works of the law, must be of profound significance.

In the first place the author makes a thorough investigation of Luther's relation to the scholastic doctrine of original sin, and his experience in the confessional where he frequently confessed sins, in the form of sinful thoughts and desires, which to his confessors did not seem to be sins at all. He found himself unable to accept the doctrine that baptism was sufficient to remove original sin, because the evil tendencies of nature and the desire for things forbidden persisted after baptism and caused intense pain to his tender conscience. At the same time the author warmly defends Luther against the attacks made by Roman Catholic writers upon his private life, from Cochleus to Janssen and Denifle, and refers with approbation to W. Walther's work: "For Luther against Rome" (1906). In the next place he shows how Luther, on the ground of his personal experience and the insufficiency of the means offered by the Roman church to give him peace of mind, was led to the conception of man's total depravity, and his absolute dependence upon the free grace of God.

Lic. Brann's work commends itself as an example of careful study, thorough scholarship, a vindication of Luther's private character, and a helpful contribution to the history of dogma in the time of the protestant reformation.

JOHN S. STAHR.